DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 592 CE 021 463

AUTHOR Simcoe, Annell L.
TITLE Vocational Equal Access Research Project. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Rutgers, The State Univ., New Brunswick, N.J. Dept. of Vocational-Technical Education.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO 498AH70107
PUB DATE Feb 79
GRANT G007701987
NOTE 166p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Administrative Personnel; Admission (School); Admission Criteria; Data Analysis; Data Collection; Disadvantaged Youth; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Research; *Equal Education; Financial Support; Guidance Counseling; Information Needs; Interviews; *National Surveys; Student Recruitment; Success Factors; Teaching Techniques; Vocational Directors; *Vocational Education; Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS New Jersey

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to identify barriers that have prevented large numbers of disadvantaged youth from attaining access to vocational education and to identify specific program elements associated with successful recruitment and vocational training of the educationally disadvantaged. Two modes of data collection were employed: (1) a project-developed survey instrument (The Equal Access Self-Rating Scale) mailed to a national sample of eighty vocational education state officials, program directors, teachers, and teacher educators and (2) personal interviews with a sample of twenty-one vocational program administrators and counselors drawn from vocational programs in New Jersey. Analysis of responses to the mailed survey indicated that two main obstacles to equal access and successful program completion were inadequate guidance and informational services and inadequate financial resources to support appropriate modified vocational programs for the disadvantaged. Responses to the personal interviews suggested that vocational educators regarded disadvantaged students as high risk applicants and, when forced to make priority selections, tend to admit better qualified (on the basis of previous school records) applicants. Seventeen teaching techniques and instructional management strategies (e.g., individualized instruction, competency-based instruction, etc.) were identified as success factors. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170592

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 498AH70107

Grant No. G007701987

VOCATIONAL EQUAL ACCESS RESEARCH PROJECT

Annell L. Simcoe

Rutgers University

New Brunswick, New Jersey

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

February 1979

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position of policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education

CE 021 463

ABSTRACT

Objectives

1. Identification of specific obstacles which have barred the disadvantaged from equal access to and successful completion of vocational education programs.
2. Identification of success factors related to effective vocational education programs for the disadvantaged.
3. Development of an "Equal Access Self-Rating Scale" which vocational education programs might use to assess program needs relative to improving equal access for the disadvantaged.

Procedures

Two modes of data collection were employed: (1) A project-developed survey instrument with which respondents rated (a) the importance of specific obstacles to access to and successful completion of vocational programs, and (b) the effectiveness of specific programmatic and instructional variables in teaching vocational skills to disadvantaged learners. This instrument was mailed to a national sample of 80 vocational education state officials, program directors, teachers, and teacher educators. Forty-six respondents replied. (2) Personal interviews were conducted with a sample of 21 vocational program administrators and counselors drawn from vocational programs in New Jersey.

The Equal Access Self-Rating Scale was developed by project staff in cooperation with consultants and vocational educators.

This instrument is recommended for further field-testing and validation.

Results and Implications

Analysis of responses to the mailed survey indicated that the two main obstacles to equal access and successful program completion were (1) inadequate guidance and informational services, and (2) inadequate financial resources to support appropriate modified vocational programs for the disadvantaged (a finding that replicates results reported in a previous 1976 study conducted by System Sciences, Inc. pursuant to a DHEW contract). Other results of the mail survey carried out by this grantee (Rutgers University) were as follows: The poor attendance, low self-concept, and low academic achievement of disadvantaged students were seen as obstacles by respondents; additionally, respondents tended to agree that virtually all of the programmatic/instructional techniques and the recruitment techniques represented in items were effective. The mailed survey produced no evidence to support the claim that disadvantaged students avoid vocational education because of "social stigma".

Responses to the personal interviews clearly suggested that vocational program oversubscription presents a formidable obstacle to disadvantaged students seeking access to vocational education. Vocational educators regard disadvantaged students as high risk applicants, and when forced to make priority selections, tend to admit better-qualified (on the basis of previous school records) applicants.

Comparisons of the results of the mail survey and the personal interview also indicated certain discrepancies between (1) what practices vocational educators consider effective and (2) what practices vocational educators actually apply. These points of discrepancy are recommended for additional investigation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
GLOSSARY OF TERMS	3
INTRODUCTION	4
Statement of Problem	4
Background	4
Project Objectives	10
Organization of Final Report	11
PROCEDURE	12
Development of Instrumentation	12
Survey Participants (Subjects)	15
Dissemination	15
RESULTS	16
Results of Obstacle/Success Factor Survey	16
Results of Personal Interviews	39
Rating Scale	48
CONCLUSIONS/IMPLICATIONS	52
Answers to the Problem of Oversubscription	53
Fiscal Support for Additional Materials	54
Improved Vocational Guidance Services	55
Vocational Teacher Attitude	58
Student Attitude	61
Peer Influences on Course Selection	62
Program Success Factors	63
Equal Access Self-Rating Scale	64
Summary	65
REFERENCES	67
BIBLIOGRAPHY	68
APPENDIX A	70
APPENDIX B	84
APPENDIX C	127
APPENDIX D	138

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
TABLE 1	Frequency and Percent of Ratings of Obstacles which Prevent Disadvantaged Students from Enrolling in Vocational Programs	19
TABLE 2	Obstacles to Enrollment Ranked According to Mean Ratings by Vocational Educators	21
TABLE 3	Frequency and Percent of Ratings of Obstacles which Prevent Disadvantaged Students from Succeeding in Vocational Programs	23
TABLE 4	Obstacles to Success Ranked According to Mean Ratings by Vocational Educators	25
TABLE 5	Frequency and Percent of Ratings of Successful Recruitment Strategies for Disadvantaged Students	26
TABLE 6	Successful Recruitment Techniques Ranked According to Mean Ratings by Vocational Educators	27
TABLE 7	Frequency and Percent of Ratings of Successful Teaching Techniques for Disadvantaged Students	28
TABLE 8	Successful Teaching Techniques Ranked According to Mean Ratings by Vocational Educators	30
TABLE 9	Frequency and Percent of Ratings of Successful Evaluation Techniques for Disadvantaged Students	31
TABLE 10	Evaluation Techniques Ranked According to Mean Ratings of Usefulness by Vocational Educators	32
TABLE 11	Items which Vocational Educators Agreed were Important Obstacles and Success Factors	33
TABLE 12	Equal Access Self-Rating Scale (Field Test Model)	50

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

1. AVTS - Area Vocational-Technical School which draws students from a number of sending districts.
2. Educationally Disadvantaged - Students other than classified handicapped students who cannot succeed in regular vocational programs because of low academic achievement, poor attendance, inappropriate behavior, and/or other factors such as non-supportive home life and cultural difference.
3. Obstacle - A condition that functions directly or indirectly, to deny access or reasonable chances for success.
4. Pre-vocational Program - An introductory, exploratory program to provide students an opportunity to "sample" multiple vocational areas before selecting a vocational choice.
5. Success Factor - A condition or program element that improves the chances of a disadvantaged student's enrollment in and/or successful completion of a vocational program.
6. Vocational Educator(s) - Teachers, coordinators, counsellors, administrators, program supervisors, and other educational personnel with job responsibilities for vocational education.
7. Vocational Programs - Course(s) of study, in AVTS's or comprehensive secondary schools, designed to train students for employment in traditional vocational areas.

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

As early as the mid 1960's, vocational educators, U.S. Office of Education personnel, and Congress were aware that significantly large numbers of educationally disadvantaged youth were not being served by vocational-technical educational programs across the country. Legislative efforts to solve this problem included specific provisions in the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 for a 15 percent set-aside for special vocational education programs for the disadvantaged. The Educational Amendments of 1976 increased this set-aside to 20 percent. But despite legislative provisions, the problem of equal access for the disadvantaged remained largely unsolved.

A number of studies suggested the need for research to (1) identify barriers that have prevented large numbers of disadvantaged youth from attaining access to vocational education, and (2) identify specific program elements associated with the successful recruitment and vocational training of the educationally disadvantaged. The study described in this final report was principally addressed to these two research questions.

Background

Since the enactment of Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the education of the educationally disadvantaged has been a recurring theme in professional literature. Writers such as Feldman (1970), Passow (1963), Cohen and Seldin

(1970), and Meade (1968), have addressed the problem of preparing educationally unprepared and "problem" students for the world of work. The overwhelming majority of these writings have consisted of philosophical tracts buttressed with statistical evidence (from various manpower reports prepared by the U.S. Department of Labor and Industry) demonstrating that the disadvantaged lack access to vocational education. But reports of research intended to define reasons for lack of access and specific directions to improve access are indeed scant.

A study by System Sciences, Inc., entitled Assessment of Needs in Programs of Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged and Handicapped was conducted during 1974 and 1975. As reported by the authors, findings suggest that (1) while difficult, successful vocational education for the disadvantaged had been demonstrated, (2) significant numbers of eligible students were not served, and (3) existing (at that time 15 percent) set-aside funds were inadequate--12 to 20 times more were needed. The researchers estimated that 5,500,000 eligible disadvantaged students who were in school were unserved by vocational education. This estimate approximated figures reported by Olympus Research (1976) in a similar study. The impact of this lack of access has been dramatically stated by Phillips (1976) who wrote that the large majority of the disadvantaged "serve their time in watered down and generally useless curriculum and eventually account for 70 percent of high school dropouts and 78 percent of correctional institution inmates".

The obvious question is why such a staggering number of disadvantaged youth should not receive vocational education that could provide them with salable job skills. Unfortunately, the professional literature is far from definitive in its answers, principally because of the absence of studies specifically intended to identify reasons for lack of access. Explanations, however, are prevalent. One commonly cited explanation for the inordinately low number of disadvantaged youth served by vocational education is that most area vocational schools screen and selectively choose their students, using criteria related to academic achievement, attendance, and in-school behavior--criteria that tend to systematically screen out most disadvantaged youth because these same criteria are in fact the very definition of educationally disadvantaged. And further, even with this screening process, area vocational schools are largely oversubscribed and annually turn away thousands of eligible applicants. However, this explanation fails to account for low disadvantaged enrollment in the various industrial arts, business, and home economics courses in secondary schools where enrollment in courses is a matter of student choice.

Other explanations for unequal access that have been traditionally advanced include (a) the tendency of vocational teachers to discourage the disadvantaged from enrolling in vocational courses, (b) lack of career counseling available from guidance counselors, and (c), in the case of urban districts with heavy Black student enrollments, a tendency on the part of Black

students to associate vocational education with menial labor and therefore to avoid choosing vocational courses.

The explanation that disadvantaged enrollments in vocational courses may be low because vocational educators discourage the enrollment of disadvantaged students in their courses has some support. For example, the System Sciences Study (1975) revealed that vocational teachers attached high priority to more shop/lab space as a program element needed to serve the disadvantaged and indicated that, given existing space constraints, it is only logical to admit "better" students whose school records indicate a high probability of success in vocational courses as opposed to admitting "problem" students whose school performance stamps them as "high risks" and suggests a much lower probability of success.

Similarly, the literature tends to support the argument that many disadvantaged students do not enroll in vocational programs because these students have never received the kind of career counseling that would help them establish realistic career goals and define education paths to these goals. Prediger and others (1973) found that over 75 percent of high school students had not received career planning counseling. Later, Donovan (1974) reported that the vast majority of disadvantaged students selected high school courses for reasons other than career preparation. In fact, it appears that the need for career/vocational counseling for the disadvantaged is not only acute, but also recognized by teachers and counselors, as revealed in the System Sciences Study,

where guidance and counseling was cited as the highest need area (in terms of producing equal access to vocational education) by the teachers and counselors who were surveyed.

On the other hand, evidence does not support the often heard claim that enrollments of disadvantaged in vocational education are statistically depressed because Nonwhite students (who in large urban school districts comprise a high percentage of the school population) tend to avoid vocational education for the reason that they associate it with menial labor and social stigma--perhaps a carryover from the days when minority students were tracked into vocational programs.

Professional writings on this particular issue have been arguments which are essentially subjective and offer little "hard data"; however, it appears that while there may have been some historical base for the vocational education-social stigma explanation, there is little reason to believe that it still is prevalent. In fact, vocational course enrollments in urban secondary schools in New Jersey reflect percentages of Nonwhite students that are generally consistent with the total percentages of Nonwhite students in the schools--information that seems to belie the notion that Nonwhites place a negative value upon vocational education.

In point of fact, it seems necessary at this point to clarify a compounding of terms that appears in some studies related to the disadvantaged. Some writers seem unable to deal separately with the categories of Nonwhite (especially

Black) and disadvantaged, use the terms as though they are synonymous, overlook the fact that there are Nonwhite students who are not disadvantaged, and end by concluding that if large numbers of Nnonwhite disadvantaged students do not enroll in or complete vocational education programs, it is because they are Nonwhite. The more obvious conclusion is that nonenrollment in and noncompletion of vocational programs is a function of educational disadvantagement rather than of race. That is, the typical profile of a disadvantaged student (low achievement, poor attendance, higher than average discipline referrals) characterizes the kind of student who is disenchanted with school, does not perceive how school can serve his/her needs, and is generally content to drift through the secondary school experience with little or no direction or drop out.

A research question that is linked closely to <u>why</u> the disadvantaged fail to attain equal access to vocational programs is "what can educators do to improve equal access?" Once again, little definitive information is available on this question in the literature. The voluminous System Sciences Study included a survey of vocational teachers, coordinators, counselors, aides, and other school personnel. The purpose of this survey was to identify program elements needed to improve access to vocational education for the disadvantaged. Responses revealed that the vocational teachers, coordinators, counselors, and other school personnel surveyed rated the following as "high priority" program elements within various categories.

Category	Highest Priority Program Elements
1. Program Support Services	Guidance and counseling, job placement coordinator
2. Instructional Materials, Related Services	Tools and equipment, A-V materials, individualized instructional modules and remedial materials
3. Instructional Personnel	Regular vocational education staff
4. Instruction Related Needs	Release time for planning, teacher clerical support
5. Staff Development	Teacher inservice, needs assessment
6. Community Public Relations	Community/Industry committee
7. Administration and Supervision	Program planning and development
8. Facilities	Shop/lab space, classroom space

Even a cursory inspection of these findings reveals that the highest rated elements do not represent new elements at all, and what educators see as a general need in delivering effective vocational education to the disadvantaged is essentially more of what already exists. Surprisingly, the lowest priority program elements included interpreters, student aid, bilingual texts, minority culture materials, monetary reward systems, curriculum labs, and professional meetings--all "standby" items in academic treatments of the subject and all items that have received heavy emphasis and fiscal support from U.S.O.E.

It is this background, then, which forms the theoretical underpinning for the present study.

Project Objectives

The Vocational Equal Access Project was designed to accomplish the following objectives:

1. The identification of existing barriers to equal access to vocational programs.
2. The identification of success factors associated with vocational programs modified to meet the instructional needs of the disadvantaged.
3. The development of an "equal access self rating scale" for use by school districts as a self-evaluation measure to identify any obstacles that might impede access to vocational education programs in individual districts.

The specific products associated with the first two objectives are (a) results of responses to a survey questionnaire and (b) results of interviews with vocational educators intended to define specific program and other variables in effective recruitment of and vocational instruction for the disadvantaged. The product associated with the third objective would appear to be implicit--a self-evaluation rating scale that is suitable, in terms of content and format, for use at the local district level to determine the extent to which disadvantaged students find access to vocational programs and to identify barriers to such access at the local district level.

Organization of Final Report

For the convenience of the reader, this report will treat separately, wherever appropriate, the activities related to the attainment of the three objectives. In other words, within certain subsequent subsections of this report (e.g. Data Collection) each objective will be discussed as a separate issue. This

format was selected simply to avoid any confusion and to facilitate selective retrieval of specific information items.

PROCEDURE

Development of Instrumentation

Two data collection instruments were employed in this study. The first of these was a rating scale (Obstacle/Success Factor Rating Scale) used to collect data related to (a) educator-identified obstacles to equal access, and (b) educator-identified program elements associated with successful vocational training of the disadvantaged. The first instrument was mailed to potential respondents. The second data collection instrument was a structured questionnaire that was used in personal interviews conducted by project staff. A copy of each instrument is presented in Appendix A.

The Obstacle/Success Factor Rating Scale survey was a 5 point Likert-type scale consisting of 20 items related to reasons why many disadvantaged students may be prevented from enrolling in vocational education, 16 items related to reasons why disadvantaged students (when they do enroll) may be prevented from succeeding in vocational education, 7 items related to successful recruitment of the disadvantaged, 17 items related to successful vocational instruction of the disadvantaged, and 5 items related to successful evaluation of the disadvantaged. To each of the items, the respondents were asked to indicate the nature and degree of agreement. Available responses were SA-Strongly Agree;

A-Agree; D-Disagree; SD-Strongly Disagree; and NB-No Basis for Judgment.

Content represented on the "success factor" items was drawn largely from the content items included in the System Sciences Study. Additionally "obstacle" items were compared with obstacles identified in a study conducted by Vasant (1977) and with obstacles cited in a 1976 Report by the California Department of Education entitled Barriers and Bridges. Because of the nature of this process, it is not appropriate to make any claims of content validity for the survey instrument employed in this study.

The questionnaire used for the personal interviews included both structured and open-ended questions. In order to establish uniformity in this mode of data collection, interviewers were rehearsed in the application of the funnel approach in which broad questions may be followed by increasingly specific questions. This approach permitted interviewers to "probe" and focus upon specific details of those program aspects considered germane to this investigation. It should be noted that each interview required approximately 2.5 hours to complete, and therefore allowed ample time for interviewers to extract specific and meaningful data.

A third project responsibility was to develop a Self-Rating Scale which school districts might use to assess their own progress toward making vocational education accessible and effective

for all students, including those students with educational disadvantagement. The content for items on this self-rating scale (SRS) was derived from the following sources.

1. Responses to Obstacle/Success Factor Survey.
2. Discussions with vocational educators, carried out in concert with visitations for observation and for interviewing purposes.
3. Consultation with "experts" from the New Jersey Department of Education, the New York State Department of Education, Columbia University, Princeton University, and Educational Testing Service.
4. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Guidelines for Eliminating Denial of Entry to Vocational Education Programs.

The Self-Rating Scale was first written in rough form, then reviewed and critiqued by project staff and other vocational educators. Criticisms were noted and applied in the formulation of the final draft of the SRS, which is presented in the Results section of this report. It should be noted that conversations with vocational teachers, counselors, coordinators, and administrators were of immense value (and were assigned commensurate weight) in the formulation of the Self-Rating Scale. For example, it was of prime concern that the instrument be concise enough to encourage its use. Comments from the practitioners just cited provided a significant basis for modifying the SRS to its present one-page form.

Survey Participants (Subjects)

Obstacle/Success Factor Rating Scale surveys were mailed to 80 state and local directors of secondary vocational programs in 39 states and Puerto Rico. These programs included those nominated for inclusion in NAVESNP[1] by state directors and those included in the 1975 System Sciences report. Programs studied by System Sciences were selected from lists of programs nominated by state vocational education officials as being two or three of the "most successful" vocational education programs for the disadvantaged in the state. Selections were also made from programs on file in the State Programs and Services Branch. Nominations were screened according to the following criteria:

1. programs were secondary programs for the disadvantaged,
2. programs were operational for at least their second year,
3. emphasis was given to programs that train disadvantaged for employment or continuing education.

Programs included in the interview process were randomly selected from lists of all eligible schools within each sample county; that is, secondary schools offering vocational programs.

Dissemination

Because dissemination was considered important, a conference was held on January 11 and 12, 1979. A total of 42 teachers, administrators, and guidance counselors participated, receiving

---

[1] 100 Special Needs Programs, National Association of Vocational Education Special Needs Personnel. (Paterson, NJ, Employment Orientation Programs), 1975.

information about access problems and instructional strategies useful in teaching vocational skills to disadvantaged learners. Because of teacher-expressed concerns about managing the unacceptable behavior of disadvantaged youth--many of whom may be delinquent-prone--this conference was characterized by a heavy emphasis upon behavior management and program development.

On the afternoon of the second day of the conference, participants divided into small work groups and generated suggestions for model program elements, applying in the process the content that had been presented previously in the conference. Conference-related documents are presented in Appendix B.

RESULTS

Results of Project activities fall into three categories: (a) responses to the Obstacle/Success Factor Survey which was mailed to program and state vocational administrators and other vocational educators, (b) responses obtained through personal interviews with vocational education practitioners at 21 schools in New Jersey, and (c) the finished version of the Self-Rating Scale. In this section, each of these three results will be presented and discussed separately.

Results of Obstacle/Success Factor Survey

The instrument to identify (1) obstacles to equal access, and (2) success factors in vocational education for the disadvantaged was mailed to 81 recipients (Appendix C); 46 of these recipients responded. Follow-up checks by project staff revealed

that at least seven of the programs had been discontinued and their directors could not be reached. These recipients were not replaced. Additionally, some survey recipients replied that they did not, as a matter of policy, respond to any questionnaires or surveys (a viewpoint that may be increasingly prevalent).

Responses from the 46 completed surveys were tallied according to frequency of ratings for each of the five rating points for each item on the survey. Rating points were assigned the following values:

Strongly Agree (SA)	+2
Agree (A)	+1
No Basis for Opinion (NB)	0
Disagree (D)	-1
Strongly Disagree (SD)	-2

A mean rating for each item was then computed by applying the following formula:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{2f_{SA} + f_A + (-f_D) + (-2f_{SD})}{f_{SA} + f_A + f_D + f_{SD}}$$

[Responses of N.B. (no basis for opinion) were treated a neutral and were not included in calculating the mean rating for each item.]

A complete analysis of responses to the obstacle/success factor rating scale is presented in Tables 1-10. Tables 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 show data concerning the frequency with which respondents rated each of the five rating points (strongly agree, agree, no basis for opinion, disagree, strongly disagree) for

each item. Tables 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 show the rank order of obstacle and success factor items according to their respective mean ratings.

The sequential pattern of tables is shown below:

Obstacles to enrollment	Tables 1, 2
Obstacles to successful program completion	Tables 3, 4
Successful recruitment strategies	Tables 5, 6
Successful teaching strategies	Tables 7, 8
Successful evaluation strategies	Tables 9, 10
Summary of obstacles and success factors receiving general agreement	Table 11

It was considered desirable to establish a pre-determined point at or above which the mean rating for each item would be regarded as indicative of general agreement among the respondents. Accordingly, a mean rating of +.67 was established as a "cut-off" point and was applied consistently to the item ratings represented in Tables 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10. Using the weighted formula to compute means, a mean item rating of +.67 represents a substantial body of agreement coupled with a minimal tendency toward disagreement, and thus, in the judgment of the grantee, provides a tenable indicator of agreement.

Questionnaire items which vocational educators agreed were important either as obstacles to access or as success factors--i.e., those items whose mean ratings were +.67 or above--are shown in summary form in Table 11.

TABLE 1

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF RATINGS OF OBSTACLES WHICH PREVENT DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS FROM ENROLLING IN VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

N = 46

	Item Obstacles to Enrollment	NB N	NB %	SA N	SA %	A N	A %	D N	D %	SD N	SD %
A.	Poor self image	1	2	13	28	19	41	11	24	2	4
B.	Lack of confidence	1	2	15	32	19	41	10	21	1	2
C.	Fear of trying	1	2	10	22	22	48	11	24	2	4
D.	Hostile attitude	3	7	11	24	14	30	16	35	2	4
E.	Fear of accepting responsibility	3	7	8	17	18	39	16	35	1	2
F.	Fear of opposing family wishes	3	7	1	2	16	35	22	47	4	9
G.	Poor work attitudes	1	2	11	24	19	41	14	30	1	2
H.	Poor attendance	1	2	14	30	23	50	7	15	1	2
I.	Unrealistic expectations compared to actual abilities	2	4	9	20	17	37	16	35	2	4
J.	Lack of interest in any vocational programs	1	2	5	11	15	33	21	46	4	8
K.	Lack of information about vocational programs and employment possibilities	1	2	12	26	26	57	6	13	1	2
L.	Belief that vocational education offers training for menial or low level jobs	2	4	8	17	14	30	18	39	4	9

TABLE 1 (cont.)

Item Obstacles to Enrollment	NB N	NB %	SA N	SA %	A N	A %	D N	D %	SD N	SD %
M. Employers' prejudice	4	9	5	11	12	26	24	52	1	2
N. Teachers' prejudice	3	7	9	20	16	35	18	39	0	0
O. Students' prejudice	4	9	5	11	19	41	17	37	1	2
P. Attitude that government support is better than working for low wages	7	15	7	15	15	33	10	22	7	15
Q. Union opposition to hiring of minorities and/or disadvantaged	13	28	5	11	4	9	19	41	5	11
R. Teacher fear that not enough time is available to adequately serve disadvantaged students	4	9	7	15	15	33	17	37	3	7
S. Teacher fear of watering down courses for disadvantaged students	2	4	8	17	14	30	21	46	1	2
T. Teacher fear that disadvantaged students would be discipline problems	2	4	13	28	19	41	12	26	0	0

NB = No Basis for Opinion
SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

TABLE 2

OBSTACLES TO ENROLLMENT RANKED ACCORDING TO MEAN RATINGS BY VOCATIONAL EDUCATORS

	Item Obstacle	N	Mean*	Rank
K.	Their lack of information about vocational programs and employment possibilities	45	.93	1.5
H.	Their poor attendance	45	.93	1.5
B.	Their lack of confidence	45	.82	3
T.	Teacher fear that disadvantaged students would be discipline problems	44	.75	4
A.	Their poor self image	45	.67	5
C.	Their fear of trying	45	.60	6
G.	Their poor work attitudes	45	.56	7
E.	Their fear of accepting responsibility	43	.37	8.3
D.	Their hostile attitude	43	.37	8.3
N.	Teachers' prejudice	43	.37	8.3
I.	Their unrealistic expectations compared to actual abilities	44	.34	11
O.	Students' prejudice	42	.24	12
S.	Teacher fear of watering down courses for disadvantaged students	44	.16	13
R.	Teacher fear that not enough time is available to adequately serve disadvantaged students	42	.14	14
P.	Attitude that government support is better than working for low wages	39	.13	15
L.	Their belief that vocational education offers training for menial or low level jobs	44	.09	16.5

TABLE 2 (cont.)

Item Obstacle	N	Mean*	Rank
J. Their lack of interest in any vocational programs	45	-.09	16.5
M. Employers' prejudice	42	-.10	18
F. Fear of opposing family wishes	43	-.28	19
Q. Union opposition	33	-.46	20

*Means were derived by assigning the following values:

SA (Strongly Agree) = +2 SD (Strongly Disagree) = -2
A (Agree) = +1 D (Disagree) = -1

Responses of "NB" (No Basis for Opinion) were considered neutral and not included in the calculation of mean response scores of items.

TABLE 3

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF RATINGS OF OBSTACLES WHICH PREVENT DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS FROM SUCCEEDING IN VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

N = 46

	Item Obstacles to Success	NB		SA		A		D		SD	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A.	They do not complete assignments on time	1	2	3	7	20	43	19	41	3	7
B.	They lack interest in class	1	2	3	7	18	39	23	50	1	2
C.	They are easily frustrated with their rate of progress in acquiring skills	1	2	9	20	29	63	6	13	1	2
D.	They lack motivation	1	2	13	28	18	39	13	28	1	2
E.	They cannot adjust to class discipline	1	2	5	11	17	37	20	43	3	7
F.	They have a high rate of absenteeism	1	2	12	26	21	46	11	24	1	2
G.	They have attained low academic achievement	1	2	9	20	26	57	10	22	0	0
H.	They are unable to perform well in their preferred vocational area	2	4	1	2	10	22	31	67	2	4
I.	They have health problems	5	11	0	0	16	35	21	46	4	9
J.	Teachers are unwilling or unable to provide extra time for disadvantaged students	1	2	10	22	17	37	15	33	3	7

TABLE 3 (cont.)

Item Obstacles to Success	NB N	NB %	SA N	SA %	A N	A %	D N	D %	SD N	SD %
K. Teachers become discouraged at students' rate of progress	1	2	6	13	28	61	8	17	3	7
L. Strained relationships exist between disadvantaged students and other class members	5	11	4	9	13	28	22	48	2	4
M. Remedial instruction is not effective	1	2	2	4	9	20	24	52	10	22
N. Printed materials are difficult to read	2	4	11	24	21	46	11	24	1	2
O. Audio/visual materials are difficult to comprehend	1	2	7	15	17	37	18	39	3	7
P. There is a lack of school finances to acquire materials in multiple modes and levels, support services, and aides	1	2	17	37	18	39	10	22	0	0

NB = No Basis for Opinion
SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

TABLE 4

OBSTACLES TO SUCCESS RANKED ACCORDING TO MEAN RATINGS BY VOCATIONAL EDUCATORS

	Item Obstacle	N	Mean*	Rank
P.	There is a lack of school finances to acquire materials in multiple modes and levels, support services, and aides	45	.93	1
C.	They are easily frustrated with their rate of progress in acquiring skill	45	.87	2
G.	They have attained low academic achievement	45	.76	3
F.	They have a high rate of absenteeism	45	.71	4
N.	Printed materials are difficult to read	44	.68	5
D.	They lack motivation	45	.64	6
K.	Teachers become discouraged at students' rate of progress	45	.58	7
J.	Teachers are unwilling or unable to provide extra time and effort for disadvantaged students	45	.36	8
O.	Audio/visual materials are difficult to comprehend	45	.16	9
A.	They do not complete assignments on time	45	.02	10.5
E.	They cannot adjust to class discipline	45	.02	10.5
B.	They lack interest in class	45	-.02	10.5
L.	Strained relationships exist between disadvantaged students and other class members	41	-.12	13
I.	They have health problems	41	-.32	14
H.	They are unable to perform well in their preferred vocational area	44	-.52	15
M.	Remedial instruction is not effective	45	-.69	16

*Means were derived by assigning the following values:

SA (Strongly Agree) = +2 SD (Strongly Disagree) = -2
A (Agree) = +1 D (Disagree) = -1

Responses of "NB" (No Basis for Opinion) were considered neutral and not included in the calculation of mean response scores of items.

TABLE 5

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF RATINGS OF SUCCESSFUL RECRUITMENT STRATEGIES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

N = 46

	Item Recruitment Strategies	NB		SA		A		D		SD	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A.	Personal contacts by past students and acquaintances	3	7	20	43	22	48	1	2	0	0
B.	Public awareness by printed and broadcast media	3	7	4	9	28	61	10	22	1	2
C.	Personal contact during home visits	4	9	21	46	16	35	5	11	0	0
D.	Referral by guidance counselors and/or school	0	0	27	59	16	35	3	7	0	0
E.	Visits to sending school by vocational school staff and students	4	9	16	35	24	52	2	4	0	0
F.	Advertisements sent to parents	6	13	4	9	21	46	13	28	0	0
G.	Community organizations	8	17	8	17	25	54	5	11	0	0

NB = No Basis for Opinion
SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

TABLE 6

SUCCESSFUL RECRUITMENT TECHNIQUES RANKED ACCORDING TO MEAN RATINGS BY VOCATIONAL EDUCATORS

	Item Recruitment Technique	N	Mean*	Rank
D.	Referral by guidance counselors and/or school	46	1.46	1
A.	Personal contacts by past students and acquaintances	43	1.42	2
E.	Visits to sending schools by vocational staff and students	42	1.29	3
C.	Personal contact during home visits	42	1.26	4
G.	Community organizations	38	.95	5
B.	Public awareness by printed and broadcast media	43	.56	6
F.	Advertisements sent to parents	40	.30	7

*Means were derived by assigning the following values:

SA (Strongly Agree) = +2 SD (Strongly Disagree) = -2
A (Agree) = +1 D (Disagree) = -1

Responses of "NB" (No Basis for Opinion) were considered neutral and not included in the calculation of mean response scores of items.

TABLE 7

FREQUENCY AND PRECENT OF RATINGS OF SUCCESSFUL TEACHING TECHNIQUES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

N = 46

	Item Techniques/Materials	NB N	NB %	SA N	SA %	A N	A %	D N	D %	SD N	SD %
A.	Individualized instruction	0	0	39	85	7	15	0	0	0	0
B.	Peer tutoring	1	2	11	24	31	67	3	7	0	0
C.	"Hands on" experiences	0	0	40	87	6	13	0	0	0	0
D.	Behavior modification	6	13	23	50	16	35	1	2	0	0
E.	Competency-based instruction	2	4	18	39	23	50	3	6	0	0
F.	Field trips	0	0	26	57	18	39	2	4	0	0
G.	Commercially prepared AV materials	1	2	13	28	26	57	6	13	0	0
H.	Commercially prepared printed materials	1	2	3	7	28	61	14	30	0	0
I.	Teacher-made audio and/or visual materials	0	0	25	54	21	46	0	0	0	0
J.	Teacher-made printed materials	0	0	25	54	20	43	1	2	0	0
K.	Student therapy or group counseling sessions	1	2	21	46	20	43	4	9	0	0
L.	Special counselors and individual counseling	2	4	22	48	20	43	2	4	0	0
M.	Buddy systems	9	20	10	22	22	48	5	11	0	0

TABLE 7 (cont.)

Item Techniques/Materials	NB N	NB %	SA N	SA %	A N	A %	D N	D %	SD N	SD %
N. Remedial instruction related to shop experiences	2	4	32	70	10	22	2	4	0	0
O. Home-school counselors	10	22	18	39	17	37	1	2	0	0
P. Teacher aides to support instruction	2	4	19	41	21	46	4	9	0	0
Q. Mastery learning (No time limits)	9	20	13	28	19	41	4	9	1	2

NB = No Basis for Opinion
SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

TABLE 8

SUCCESSFUL TEACHING TECHNIQUES RANKED ACCORDING TO MEAN RATINGS BY VOCATIONAL EDUCATORS

	Item Techniques	N	Mean*	Rank
C.	"Hands on" experiences	46	1.87	1
A.	Individualized instruction	46	1.85	2
N.	Remedial instruction related to shop	44	1.64	3
I.	Teacher made audio and/or visual materials	46	1.54	4
D.	Behavior modification methods	40	1.53	5
J.	Teacher made printed materials	46	1.50	6
F.	Field trips	46	1.48	7
O.	Home-school counselors	36	1.44	8
L.	Special counselors and individual counseling	44	1.41	9
K.	Student therapy or group counseling sessions	45	1.29	10
E.	Competency-based instruction	44	1.27	11
P.	Teacher aids to support instruction	44	1.25	12
B.	Peer tutoring	45	1.11	13
Q.	Mastery learning (no time limits)	37	1.05	14
G.	Commercially prepared audio-visual materials	46	1.02	15
M.	Buddy systems	37	1.00	16
H.	Commercially prepared printed materials	46	.44	17

*Means were derived by assigning the following values:

SA (Strongly Agree) = +2 SD (Strongly Disagree) = -2
A (Agree) = +1 D (Disagree) = -1

Responses of "NB" (No Basis for Opinion) were considered neutral and not included in the calculation of mean response scores of items.

TABLE 9

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF RATINGS OF SUCCESSFUL EVALUATION TECHNIQUES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

N = 46

	Item Evaluation Techniques	NB		SA		A		D		SD	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A.	Psychometric testing	13	28	4	9	24	52	4	9	1	2
B.	Teacher evaluation	0	0	29	63	13	28	4	9	0	0
C.	Work evaluation	0	0	21	46	25	54	0	0	0	0
D.	Counselor interpretation of tests	3	7	7	15	28	61	7	15	1	2
E.	Personal interview with counselor	3	7	12	26	27	59	3	7	1	2

NB = No Basis for Opinion
SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

TABLE 10

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES RANKED ACCORDING TO STRENGTH OF MEAN RATINGS OF USEFULNESS BY VOCATIONAL EDUCATORS

	Item Evaluation Technique	N	Mean*	Rank
C.	Work evaluation	46	1.46	1.5
B.	Teacher evaluation	46	1.46	1.5
E.	Personal interview with counselor	43	1.07	3
A.	Psychometric testing	33	.79	4
D.	Counselor interpretation of tests	43	.77	5

*Means were derived by assigning the following values:

SA (Strongly Agree) = +2 SD (Strongly Disagree) = -2
A (Agree) = +1 D (Disagree) = -1

Responses of "NB" (No Basis for Opinion) were considered neutral and not included in the calculation of mean response scores of items.

TABLE 11

ITEMS WHICH VOCATIONAL EDUCATORS AGREED
WERE IMPORTANT OBSTACLES AND SUCCESS FACTORS

OBSTACLES TO ENROLLMENT

1. Student lack of information about vocational programs and employment possibilities.
2. Poor attendance by students.
3. Student lack of confidence.
4. Teacher fears that students would be discipline problems.
5. Poor self image of students.

OBSTACLES TO SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION

1. Lack of school finances to acquire necessary variety of materials and supportive services.
2. Students are easily frustrated by low rate of progress in acquiring skills.
3. Low student academic achievement.
4. High rate of student absenteeism.
5. Student difficulty in reading printed materials.

SUCCESSFUL RECRUITMENT TECHNIQUES

1. Visits to sending schools by vocational staff and students.
2. Referrals by guidance counselors and/or school.
3. Personal contacts by past students and acquaintances.
4. Personal contacts during home visits by school staff.
5. Community organizations.

SUCCESSFUL TEACHING TECHNIQUES

1. Hands-on experience.
2. Individualized instruction.
3. Remedial instruction related to shop.
4. Teacher made audiovisual materials.
5. Behavior modification methods.
6. Teacher made printed materials.
7. Field trips.
8. Home-school counselors.
9. Special counselors and individual counseling.
10. Student therapy or group counseling sessions.
11. Competency-based instruction.
12. Teacher aides to support instruction.
13. Peer tutoring.
14. Mastery learning (no time limits)
15. Commercially prepared audiovisual materials.
16. Buddy systems.

TABLE 11 (cont.)

SUCCESSFUL EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

1. Work evaluation.
2. Teacher evaluation.
3. Personal interview with counselor.
4. Psychometric testing.
5. Counselor interpretation of tests.

Because Tables 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 11 contain information presented in terms of mean ratings of items, these tables are best suited for purposes of discussing the results of the obstacle/success factor rating scale. Table 11 provides a summary of the various obstacles and success factors which the vocational education respondents to the "mail survey" (the obstacle/success factor rating scale) generally agreed were important obstacles to equal access or important techniques in recruiting, teaching, and evaluating disadvantaged students in vocational education. Accordingly, Table 11 represents the nucleus of the results obtained through the mail survey.

Even a cursory inspection of Table 11 indicates that the Obstacle/Success Factor Rating Scale (questionnaire) produced results that were generally consistent with those obtained in the System Sciences study. More specifically, the need for more guidance and informational services and the need for more financial resources were identified in both studies as being two of the most important obstacles to effective vocational education for the disadvantaged.

A closer look reveals that three of the five important obstacles to enrollment, and four of the five important obstacles to successful completion, based upon ratings of vocational educators, were obstacles that might be described as student-based (poor attendance, poor self-image, low reading ability, etc.) as opposed to program-based (inadequate guidance services). Some possible implications will be discussed in the following section

of this report; however, it should be noted that one inevitable conclusion is that solutions to student-based obstacles involve changing student characteristics, while answers to program-based obstacles involve changing program characteristics. Additionally, it might be pointed out that all of the student-based obstacles in Table 11 are essentially related to the functional deficits that define the term educationally disadvantaged. If an alternative interpretation can be offered, a logical conclusion might be that the respondent considered the disadvantaged students themselves to be the greatest source of obstacles to access to and successful completion of vocational programs--a conclusion somewhat akin to physicians' expressing the notion that the main obstacles to good health and effective medical treatment are the various illnesses of their patients.

Other tables provide some useful information. For example, an examination of Table 2 reveals that respondents placed little importance upon items I and L, which suggested, respectively, that lack of student interest in vocational programs and student belief that vocational education offers training for menial or low level jobs might represent obstacles to access to vocational programs. In fact, both of these items received negative mean ratings. This finding would seem to disprove, as did the results of the System Sciences Study, the once popular notion that disadvantaged students, particularly minority group students, tend to avoid vocational education because they associate it with some kind of social stigma. Results shown in Table 2 also fail

to support other notions that generally tend to link low enrollment of disadvantaged students in vocational education to student fear of accepting responsibility, student hostility, unrealistic student self-assessment of abilities, and the often-heard claim that the disadvantaged prefer government support to working for low wages.

But the results shown in Table 2 should be interpreted with the knowledge that this study surveyed educators, not students, and that the results, therefore, represent what vocational educators say about the attitudes of disadvantaged students--not what disadvantaged students say about their own attitudes.

Inspection of Table 4 shows an interesting pattern of mean ratings of items, in that after the first five items of general agreement, there are two "marginal" items, then ratings plummet sharply. And among the lowest rated obstacles to success were the following: The disadvantaged cannot complete assignments on time; they cannot adjust to class discipline; they have health problems; and they lack interest in class. The conclusion must be that vocational educator respondents simply did not accept these explanations.

This finding should be regarded as somewhat of a mild surprise, for it represents a departure from the stereotyped picture of educators reciting a ritual list of the characteristic deficits of disadvantaged students by way of explaining why these students may be underserved by vocational education.

The results shown in Table 8 also deserve some comment at this point, principally because respondents tended to rate as

important success factors 16 of the 17 teaching techniques on the questionnaire. These techniques ranged from standard vocational education practices such as "hands-on" experience to practices alien to most vocational programs, such as student therapy or group counseling sessions. The logical implication associated with these results would appear to be that respondents believed that virtually any of these teaching techniques (some items are more precisely described as supportive services) can make an important contribution to the improvement of vocational education for the disadvantaged.

Table 10 shows the same pattern of general acceptance of items as does Table 8, except that the five items in Table 10 deal with techniques of evaluating vocational shop and classroom performance of disadvantaged students. And respondent familiarity with the techniques expressed on the questionnaire items cannot be an explanation for the fact that all five items were rated as important success factors, because the techniques involved ranged from work evaluation and teacher evaluation (which are almost universally used in vocational programs) to a personal interview with a counselor (which seldom takes place in actual practice).

It would appear then that the only interpretation that can be derived from Table 10 is that the respondents accepted the effectiveness of all the evaluation techniques.

Recruitment techniques were rated and results appear in Table 6, which shows that respondents regarded five techniques as being important in the recruitment of disadvantaged students. It is interesting to note that although respondents to the mail

survey, as indicated in Table 6, generally agreed on the usefulness of a variety of recruitment techniques, most of which could be implemented with minimal additional expense, the results of the personal interview survey described later in this report suggest that few of these important techniques are systematically used.

Results of Personal Interviews

As mentioned earlier in this report, personal interviews were conducted with vocational teachers and administrators in a sample of 21 schools (area vocational-technical secondary schools and comprehensive high schools) distributed among six counties in New Jersey. These interviews focused upon enrollment and admission variables which might serve as obstacles to disadvantaged students.

Although a structured interview questionnaire was developed and used to provide a consistent base for data collection, responses varied considerably among interviewees, thereby making any quantifiable representation of data in table form inappropriate. However, interviewers did retain notes associated with the results of each individual interview, and these notes comprise the basis for the following reported results.

Obstacles to Enrollment: Oversubscription/Admission Standards. Without question, the most formidable obstacle that confronts the disadvantaged student seeking to enroll in a vocational school is the problem of oversubscription. All but three schools represented in the interview survey were well oversubscribed--in other words, were unable to accept all their applicants because of space and

other program limits. (Of the three undersubscribed schools, two--both in the same county--were undersubscribed only because one of the schools had been newly opened and enrollments had been somewhat "artificially" diluted.)

As examples of oversubscription, one county area vocational-technical school reported an applicants-to-admissions ratio of four to one. In two other county vocational schools, applicants outnumbered admissions by a two-to-one ratio. Other oversubscription ratios ranged from 1.2-to-1 up to 1.6-to-1. These results are associated with gross applicant/admission comparisons. However, the same problem of oversubscription applied to the modified special needs programs offered by the various area vocational-technical schools. For instance, one special needs program in its first year of operation was able to admit only 285 of 1,000 applicants. Another special needs vocational program, despite being enlarged to accommodate nearly 800 special needs students, has had to turn away approximately 250. And these numbers refer to total special needs applicants (handicapped as well as disadvantaged). When these two categories are examined separately, the problem of equal access for the disadvantaged looms in greater magnification, since handicapped students make up over 90 percent of the total students enrolled in special needs programs in area vocational-technical schools in New Jersey.

In order to define the obstacle to enrollment problems more sharply, interviewers collected data associated with admission requirements imposed by various vocational schools. The results of interviews revealed that all area vocational schools

represented in the interview sample screened applicants relative to academic, attendance, and discipline records--a procedure that systematically eliminates most disadvantaged students from serious consideration for admission to regular vocational programs, since these students by definition have poor records in all of these categories. (Representative admissions criteria are presented in Appendix D.) And, the special needs programs offer little hope for the disadvantaged because these programs for all practical purposes are intended to serve the handicapped not the disadvantaged--and in point of fact, cannot even accommodate all the handicapped students who apply.

More specifically, 17 of 21 school directors considered attendance and conduct to be the most critical factors in determining admission and reported that applicants with poor attendance and discipline records were seldom admitted except to "fill" a particular class that might be undersubscribed--provided, of course, that student interest matched this class content. (Two schools admitted students on a first-come basis, one school based admission on interest in a particular shop or program, and one school was able to admit all candidates.)

Eleven schools (52.38%) either required an interview or permitted applicants with poor conduct and attendance to defend their interest in applying to the vocational school. Three schools required interviews of all applicants and, in order to insure home-school cooperation, stipulated that an adult accompany the applicant.

All vocational program directors who were interviewed believed that student interest (as determined by an interview, comments on the application form, and/or stated career choice) was crucial to successful program completion. Interest in a selected shop or area was used to determine admission (along with aptitude scores in one school), students whose first shop preference could be accommodated were given priority in the admissions process. In one of the two open enrollment programs, it was assumed that the more interested applicants would apply early in the year; therefore, the admissions policy was "first come, first served". "Less eager" students who decided to apply later were placed on a waiting list.

While no school required an A or B average, grades were considered important (after attendance, conduct, and attitude) in fifteen (71%) of the twenty-one vocational schools. Academic records were examined for evidence of stability and effort. (A straight C average was considered less erratic than a mixture of A's and D's.)

While grade level achievement in reading and mathematics was considered desirable--even essential--only one school applied a firm "cut-off" score in either reading or mathematics. (The principal of this school said that students who need extensive remediation would find the program too frustrating, and, therefore the school should not accommodate anyone with less than sixth grade achievement levels.) Most schools, however, did use reading and mathematics scores for placement and counseling, and

poor achievement scores often limited a student's choice of shops. For example, disadvantaged minority youngsters experience considerable difficulty gaining access to the technical areas such as electronics and practical nursing, areas in which poor preparation in mathematics and reading have been identified by school personnel as barriers to success.

Additionally, shop safety is a primary consideration in most shops. Interviewees expressed the belief that youngsters who resent safety and attendance requirements may have difficulty in following shop safety regulations and cited this belief as rationale for excluding applicants on the basis of poor attendance and discipline records.

The admissions obstacles to enrollment of disadvantaged students in vocational education affect Nonwhites as well as Whites. Nonwhite students--both disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged--have sought admission to area vocational schools, often in order to escape the violence and other problems in large urban comprehensive secondary schools. This trend has been particularly true of female students. But, here again, admission standards tend to exclude disadvantaged Nonwhite students just as these standards tend to exclude disadvantaged White students, for when interviewers asked the obvious question, "Who gets admitted?", the answer was that the vocational schools first admitted the "qualified" applicants from these Nonwhite students; and those applicants whose school records were consistent with definitions of educational disadvantagement were admitted only in those rare

instances when the number of qualified applicants happened to be lower than the number of "openings".

To summarize the interview results associated with vocational program oversubscription as an obstacle to equal access for the disadvantaged, it appears that:

1. Most area vocational schools, because of facility and resource limitations, cannot programmatically accommodate all of those applicants who do meet admission standards.
2. Existing admission standards in most area vocational-technical schools tend to disqualify most educationally disadvantaged students from admission--except to "unpopular" course areas that may be undersubscribed.
3. Nonwhite minority enrollments in vocational programs are essentially representative of Nonwhite minority enrollments in nonvocational programs.

Obstacles to Enrollment: Recruitment. The guidance departments in the local sending schools serve principally as "turnkey intermediaries" in admission to vocational schools. Students submit applications through the guidance office and may approach on their own initiative the guidance department for information about vocational offerings. But sending school guidance departments seldom take aggressive steps to dispense vocational information to students. Vocational schools apparently conduct their own recruitment. Seventeen of the 21 schools in the interview sample prepared special information sessions and bulletins concerning their programs--as opposed to four heavily oversubscribed

schools in which publicity activities were at best, perfunctory. Vocational school recruitment efforts included (in varying degrees among schools):

- special slide and taped programs with music (two schools)
- visits to sending schools by vocational staff and students (five schools--when staff are available)
- pamphlets describing courses and vocational opportunities
- open house and career days at the vocational schools
- special orientation programs to make sending school guidance staffs aware of vocational offerings

However, presentations by vocational school staff are not usually made to the entire sending school enrollment; only those students who express an interest in vocational training are advised to attend these sessions by the sending school guidance staff. Accordingly, most disadvantaged students are bypassed by these recruitment efforts.

Vocational school administrators were divided in their opinions concerning the effectiveness of the preceding publicity arrangements in informing guidance staff and students about vocational school programs. Vocational administrators (in these 21 schools) believed that many sending school guidance directors neglect or ignore vocational program descriptions either because they (a) consider vocational schools "dumping grounds" for the alienated or academically inferior student, (b) prefer to interest students in college preparatory programs, and/or (c) are apprehensive about approaching students concerning vocational training

because this approach may be construed as an attempt to "track" students (especially minority students) into less prestigious professions. This viewpoint tends to support the previously reported finding that lack of information may be an obstacle to equal access to vocational programs. Indeed, project interviewers found no evidence that guidance programs in sending high schools made efforts to aggressively inform students about vocational programs.

Another interview result was the (not very surprising) finding that most students prefer to attend school with their friends. Of the 21 vocational program directors interviewed, eighteen (85.71%) estimated that from 70 to 90 percent of their present student body was either related to, or acquainted with, former or present students. (Three directors were unable to arrive at estimates.) Therefore, one barrier to enrollment may be membership in a peer group which has not been, or is not now interested in or enrolled in vocational training. Such a situation would seem to be self-perpetuating as well as conducive to the discouragement of application from many disadvantaged students. Additionally, this situation was reported in comprehensive secondary schools as well as area vocational schools.

Teaching and Evaluation. None of the vocational directors and teachers interviewed in this study had developed extensive model programs to improve the performance of minority disadvantaged students. Disadvantaged students, in some schools, were given remedial instruction in reading and mathematics through

State Compensatory Education (SCE) programs. Most vocational shop teachers also reported using charts and other visuals in class to compensate for the below grade reading ability of students.

Only five of the 21 schools made special efforts to involve both shop and academic teachers in reading and mathematics remediation. In other schools, articulation between shops, academic areas, and compensatory education was absent. An academically deficient student may receive some generalized remedial assistance, but he or she receives little or no tutorial assistance related to the reading and mathematics required to succeed in a particular vocational area.

The following techniques were mentioned as being effective in improving behavior and academic performance: "rap" and therapy sessions, special classes for the "socially maladjusted" complete with "crisis intervention" teachers and special materials, student contracts, point systems for correcting tardiness and minor infractions, modified vocational and academic instruction to include reading and mathematics as well as vocational content, and placement with adults in evening classes. Few schools reported the use of more than one of the preceding techniques. An attempt at mastery learning with extended time in grade was reported by one administrator, but most vocational directors indicated that they lacked the space and staff required to implement an ungraded mastery approach in vocational education.

Rating Scale

A third project result (or product) was an equal access self-rating scale. The self-rating scale was developed to allow administrators to evaluate their progress towards helping disadvantaged students avail themselves of vocational education. This self-rating scale was derived from those features or success factors identified in the previous research sections and also reflects the suggestions of consultants from the State University of New York, Columbia, Princeton, and Educational Testing Service. (Individual consultant specialties were social psychology, administration, and education of delinquents and disadvanteged.) Another source of consideration were recently published DHEW guidelines for eliminating denial of services in Vocational Educational Programs.

The items included on the self-rating scale also reflect the following reasoning. School and vocational directors in New Jersey described successful students as those with a high interest in vocational programs, friends who were (or have been) enrolled in the program, and adequate prerequisite skills. Applicants with very low reading or math scores often cannot enroll in programs such as electronics, beauty culture, business, and other technical fields. While one school allowed students to enroll in any program, lack of special tutoring to supplement work in these shops made successful completion difficult. Also students were not permitted to remain in shops indefinitely--or until mastery. As a result, permission to attend a shop or class

is simply a permission to enroll one semester and fail the next. Therefore, even when disadvantaged do gain access to vocational programs, this access may not be as "equal" as ideally planned. Disadvantaged students need not only access to programs but also special support necessary for them to achieve realistic employment goals. Therefore, the Self-Rating Scale (Table 12) developed in this study contains items related to the effective completion of, as well as the admission to, vocational programs.

TABLE 12

EQUAL ACCESS SELF-RATING SCALE
(FIELD TEST MODEL)

INSTRUCTIONS: For each of the items below, circle one point on the 7 point scale that best describes the existing condition in your school--as it applies to the educationally disadvantaged students (not classified handicapped) with identifiable deficits in academic achievement, attendance, or school behavior. Equal access "score" is the total of all point values circled.

	1 2	3 4 5	6 7
A.	Guidance provides vocational education information only to students who ask for it.	Guidance makes written vocational education information available to all students	Guidance takes affirmative steps to inform students of vocational education options.
B.	Guidance provides no vocational counseling (other than commercial written materials)	Guidance provides vocational counseling only upon student request.	Guidance schedules individual vocational and career counseling for each student.
C.	No cooperative education coordinator time is allocated specifically for disadvantaged students.	A cooperative education coordinator is specifically assigned some responsibilities for disadvantaged students.	A full time cooperative education-2 coordinator serves disadvantaged students.
D.	No prevocational program is available.	A prevocational program is available for students who qualify.	A prevocational program is available with open enrollment.
E.	No attempt (beyond normal discipline efforts) is made to modify student attendance and behavior.	Some resources are available to improve student attendance and behavior.	Special in-school resources are systematically applied to improve student attendance and behavior.

F.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
	No additional resources are available to teach the disadvantaged.		Some vocational teachers may receive additional resources to teach the disadvantaged.			Vocational teachers are systematically provided additional resources (support staff, aides, materials) to teach the disadvantaged.
G.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
	No special AV materials for the disadvantaged are available.		Some special AV materials for the disadvantaged are used in a few vocational education courses.			Special AV materials for the disadvantaged (hardware and software) are used in most vocational education courses.

This instrument has a total score "ceiling" of 49. This self-rating "score" indicates the presence of factors which are associated with successful recruitment of disadvantaged students and successful vocational education for these students. At the lowest end of the scale, a total self-rating score of 7 indicates that virtually no provisions are being made to recruit and successfully educate the disadvantaged. Scores between the lowest and highest limits represent, of course, varying degrees of programmatic efforts. However, if this self-rating scale is to have maximum value as a needs assessment instrument, the user should examine the rating for each of the seven program variables (A-G).

CONCLUSIONS/IMPLICATIONS

The results of this descriptive study should not be considered in isolation, but rather in terms of their relationship to results reported elsewhere. In this particular case, the most logical comparison is with the results of the System Sciences Study. However, it should be noted that this section involves more than the comparison just cited.

Because of differences in procedure and instrumentation that existed between this study and that conducted by System Sciences, statistical comparisons were not appropriate, but an examination of the specific findings of both studies reveals a high degree of similarity concerning what is needed to attain equal access to effective vocational education for disadvantaged students.

	Grantee's (Rutgers) Study	System Sciences Study
1.	Facilities to compensate for existing oversubscription.	Shop/lab space, classroom space.
2.	Variety of instructional materials, especially multi-modal and multi-level materials, and individualized instruction materials, non-print materials.	Tools and equipment, individualized instructional materials, remedial materials, AV materials.
3.	Supportive staff, including shop and classroom aides.	Supportive staff--clerical, aides, coordinators.
4.	Information and guidance concerning vocational programs.	Adequate vocational guidance and counseling services.

Additionally, both studies found that respondents consistently cited lack of funds for expanded facilities and resources necessary to effectively deliver services to the disadvantaged.

These areas of replication, then, would appear to serve as empirical underpinning for the following conclusions and implications tempered, of course, by the constraints normally imposed by study limitations.

Answers to the Problem of Oversubscription

One of the most significant conclusions that can be derived from this study is that there is a pressing need to find (a) means of making the services and facilities of area vocational-technical schools more accessible to educationally disadvantaged students, and (b) expanding the modified vocational offerings in comprehensive secondary schools.

The results of this study clearly revealed that oversubscription prevails in most AVTS's, thereby sharply reducing the chances for admission of disadvantaged students. Oversubscription is the result of facilities (space, staff, materials) that are too limited to meet total enrollment demands. Expansion would appear to be the logical answer. Implications for future consideration should include the expansion of evening programs such as the "Twilight Techs" that operate in some AVTS's, the use of mobile units that can deliver, through scheduled rotation, complete vocational skill training modules to various underserved locations, and more extensive application of alternative education programs designed to accommodate or compensate for the academic, motivational, and social problems which characterize the disadvantaged.

In comprehensive secondary schools the problem of limited access for the disadvantaged manifests itself a bit more subtly.

That is, in theory, students self-select their courses. But in practice, the choice of vocational programs is usually quite limited--particularly in the area of industrial arts, where class size cannot exceed the number of equipment stations available--and classes are usually filled quickly. Moreover, modified programs, while they may exist in name so that the comprehensive school districts may receive disadvantaged setaside funds, are in reality so scarce as to be virtually nonexistent, so when disadvantaged students do enroll in vocational courses they find themselves in programs actually designed for average students and, as a result, often fail or drop out of the courses. Here again, the expansion solutions described previously--more evening courses if day schedules are full, mobile units if permanent facilities are not affordable, and alternative programs if traditional programs cannot meet special student needs--seem to be logical implications.

Fiscal Support for Additional Materials

The results of the data collection activities in this study also point to the need for more fiscal resources to purchase multi-modal (including AV) and multi-level materials and to provide the additional support services that educators realize are necessary to effectively teach disadvantaged students. This need was consistently cited by respondents to the Obstacle/Success Factor Survey and by vocational educators who were participants in the interview process. This result supports the conclusion drawn by System Sciences that if the disadvantaged are to be

effectively served by vocational education, increases in existing vocational training appropriations must be provided by the Federal government and/or other sources. It should be noted, though, at the time of this writing, that YETP agreements between CETA prime sponsors and local education agencies have provided a source of monies to increase the number of special vocational education programs for disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 21. While the long-term effectiveness of this variation of the wage subsidization approach has yet to be demonstrated, there is little question that YETP has created a situation in which more disadvantaged youth are now receiving vocational training through comprehensive secondary schools, AVTS's, and community colleges.

Improved Vocational Guidance Services

Another important finding was that most vocational educators cited the lack of guidance and counseling services as the single most important obstacle to equal access to vocational education. This finding was supported by the nationwide surveys carried out by System Sciences and by the Grantee and was further supported by results of personal interviews in 21 New Jersey Secondary Schools. It appears that very few disadvantaged students receive the information that (1) vocational programs are available that could prepare them for well-paying, steady jobs, (2) special programs are available that are designed to help decrease the need for reading in learning job skills, (3) the jobs that might occur from these programs are not necessarily

"menial" and in fact include many high-skill job titles, (4) given the student's undistinguished school record, college is a very remote option, and (5) if college still is the student's goal, then vocational training (and subsequent employment) might well provide a better avenue to this goal than would simply drifting through a meaningless admixture of courses.

It should be noted that the Grantee is not necessarily presenting the above scenario as a paradigm for guidance counseling. On the other hand, it does represent an information-giving process that one might reasonably expect to occur in any guidance program.

But, if the judgments rendered by respondents in this study are an accurage gauge, this process seldom occurs in the comprehensive secondary schools--at least with disadvantaged students as recipients of the information. According to vocational educators, guidance counselors in the secondary schools which either "send" students to AVTS's or offer their own vocational courses (or both) are almost exclusively concerned with college placement and, as one vocational educator put it, "can't see beyond their Lovejoy College Guides". But according to two guidance directors and three principals who were interviewed, the main reason why the disadvantaged don't get vocational information and guidance is that disadvantaged students are apathetic. "The guidance services are there--if the students come and ask for them," said a counselor. "But they never come in. Why not? The same reason they never join clubs, never take part in school activities, and don't attend regularly. They just don't care."

And there may be truth in this statement. However, the verbalization of a problem is not its solution. Rather, the solution would appear to lie in some kind of well planned and aggressively executed system for providing, to disadvantaged students, the information they need for vocational decision making. Evidently it is not enough to say, "Information is available, now come and get it". It may be necessary for counselors to take the initiative themselves, to deliver the information to the students who will not seek it on their own initiative.

Furthermore, given the "tight" budget climates that exist in most school districts, it appears that this system would have to involve maximum use of group guidance and computerized guidance programs, for it is naive to expect that very many school districts will hire additional counselors during a period when their schools are vitally concerned with trimming staffing costs. In other words, solutions must be cost-efficient.

Actually, computer based guidance systems are not new. Several working models have been in use since 1967. In 1969, the Office of Education, DHEW, published a summary of systems (Computer-based Vocational Guidance Systems, Superintendent of Documents Catalog Number FS5.225:25053) which represents an excellent resource for educators interested in increasing vocational guidance services that are cost-efficient. In addition, the technological developments that have taken place over the past 10 years in the computer industry have served to reduce

the cost of information storage and retrieval to cost levels well below those that applied in 1969.

It is worth noting that improved vocational guidance and counseling services and related assessment programs can also be delivered as part of CETA/LEA Agreements for Youth Employment Training Programs (YETP), an approach which would seem to be immediately viable considering levels of CETA funding, emphasis upon reducing youth unemployment, and the increasing number of YETP agreements.

In short, the need for better vocational guidance and the technology to meet that need has been identified. Accordingly, it seems appropriate to recommend in this report that the improvement of vocational and career information services for disadvantaged students be given high priority by U.S.O.E. as a research issue and as a demonstration project issue.

Vocational Teacher Attitude

The general finding in this study was that there was no general prejudice on the part of the respondents concerning the admission of disadvantaged students into vocational programs. However, respondents did cite some specific practical concerns associated with high student absenteeism, unacceptable shop/classroom conduct, and--perhaps most importantly--the lack of additional facilities and resources to effectively assess vocational needs and capabilities and to effectively teach vocational skills to students with poor achievement levels in computation and reading, with poor attendance patterns, and with a

higher than average tendency toward violation of school rules and regulations. Teachers and other vocational educators who were surveyed by the Grantee indicated that they were well aware that traditional approaches alone will not adequately serve the disadvantaged, but also argued, since the existing traditional programs cannot even accommodate all the "eligible" students (who would profit from traditional approaches more than would disadvantaged students), that priority for admission to vocational education should remain upon serving those students whose prior school records demonstrate a reasonable chance for success in a traditional vocational program. And, indeed, this argument appears logical, rather than prejudicial, in nature.

In view of this finding, it appears that the real problem may be more closely associated with the need to expand facilities and resources than with a need to "convert" vocational teachers so that they are cognizant of the needs of the disadvantaged.

But the data in Table 11 reveal that three of the five educator-identified obstacles to enrollment and four of the five educator-identified obstacles to successful completion of vocational training were what may be categorized as student-based (poor attendance, poor student self-image, low reading ability) as opposed to program-based. To intimate, on the strength of this fact alone, that vocational educators prefer to "blame" disadvantaged students for their own failure to enroll and succeed in vocational programs rather than to "blame" program shortfalls would be unfair and unreasonable.

However, a careful scrutiny of Table 8 indicates that several of the educator-identified successful teaching techniques can be implemented without additional funds but were not being very widely applied in the 21 schools involved in the interview survey carried out by the grantee. Techniques such as peer tutoring, buddy systems, behavior modification, and mastery learning do not involve excess costs of any magnitude; yet few of the school personnel interviewed reported much application of these techniques, which according to respondents to the mailed questionnaire, are important factors in successful teaching of the disadvantaged.

And going a step further, the results of the interview survey revealed that only one of the five recruitment techniques rated as important success factors--referrals by guidance counselors and/or school--was systematically pursued by schools. The other four recruitment techniques, even though vocational educators apparently recognized their potential value, went largely ignored or essentially left to chance. For example, none of the 21 schools involved in the interview reported using community organizations or organized student/student contacts as methods of recruiting disadvantaged students into vocational education, and only five of the schools reported using visits to sending schools by vocational staff and students (and this practice was described basically as something that occurred as a function of teacher whim and initiative rather than of policy). In point of fact, what interviewees reported as their "staple" techniques for recruiting students (pamphlets, "open houses") were the recruitment techniques rated lowest by respondents to the mailed questionnaire.

The conclusion is, according to the results of this study, that there appears to be a considerable gulf between (1) what vocational educators agree should be done for the disadvantaged, and (2) what vocational educators actually do for the disadvantaged. As to why this gap should exist is a matter of pure speculation relative to this report. Accordingly, the grantee, having demonstrated the existence of this apparent conflict between what educators agree should be done and what they actually do, recommends that further investigation take place, with a twofold purpose. First, to verify the conclusions that seem warranted by the findings of the present study, and second, to ascertain why what is "preached" is not more widely practiced by vocational educators.

Student Attitude

Data collected in this study suggested that vocational educators who were surveyed generally agreed that disadvantaged students' lack of confidence and low frustration level were deterrents to effective learning in vocational shops and classrooms. The conclusion is (tentatively) advanced that more research may be needed to accurately assess the debilitating effects of low self-confidence and to assess whether the low student frustration level attested to by respondents is (1) actual or not, and (2) if actual, then is it the result of student psychological characteristics or simply the predictable result of a student's being assigned tasks that exceeds his/her capabilities. By way of illustration, it takes little imagination to recognize that a student who can't understand written instructions will

tend to (accurately) self-predict failure and frustration when faced with a learning task in which success is dependent to some degree upon ability to comprehend written instructions. It seems that, in this case, the student's prediction is more realistic appraisal than low self-concept.

Beyond these general comments, the Grantee cannot render judgments concerning student attitudes because the present study did not involve direct assessment of student attitudes but rather educators' perceptions of student attitudes. But this particular issue deserves further investigation, for the adverse affects of fear of failure, self-effacement, and low threshold of frustration upon learning are well known. Accordingly, it seems appropriate to recommend that subsequent research be addressed to the direct assessment of disadvantaged students' attitudes toward themselves; their chances of learning; their chances of obtaining satisfying, gainful employment; and their ability to cope with the frustrations they may experience in their attempts to learn work skills of varying complexities.

Peer Influences on Course Selection

This study found evidence indicating that disadvantaged students may often base course and program selections upon what their peers say and do. While this finding is scarcely "news" (as any guidance counselor who has logged many hours adding and dropping courses once students "see who is in their classes" can attest), it does suggest the following implication.

Assuming that disadvantaged students do tend to place considerable significance upon opinions and behaviors of their

peers (i.e., other disadvantaged students who are friends, fellow classmates, or acquaintances), it seems to be only logical and reasonable that schools "officially" capitalize on this recognized tendency by using as advisors selected graduates or students who (1) meet the definition of educationally disadvantaged and (2) have attained either gainful and satisfying employment or a more satisfactory educational experience as the result of vocational programs.

Utilization of peer advisors might take a variety of forms ranging from Homecoming Day-type programs in which graduates talk to students to less formal rap sessions held on a regular basis during or after school hours.

Program Success Factors

This particular issue is somewhat difficult to discuss much further than has been done in the "Results" section except to draw the conclusion that respondents seemed to endorse virtually all of the programmatic elements typically cited in the literature as being useful in teaching the disadvantaged. The following teaching techniques and instructional management strategies were identified as success factors:

a. Individualized instruction
b. Peer tutoring
c. "Hands on" experiences
d. Behavior modification
e. Competency-based instruction
f. Field trips
g. Commercially prepared AV materials

h. Commercially prepared printed materials

i. Teacher-made audio and/or visual materials

j. Teacher-made printed materials

k. Student therapy or group counseling sessions

l. Special counselors and individual counseling

m. Buddy systems

n. Remedial instruction related to shop experiences

o. Home-school counselors

p. Teacher aides to support instruction

q. Mastery learning (no time limits)

Since these success factors received a high degree of endorsement, the conclusion that they be integral parts of vocational programs for the disadvantaged would seem to be justified. Indeed, these success factors provided, in part, substance for the Equal Access Self-Rating Scale developed by the Grantee pursuant to this study.

Equal Access Self-Rating Scale

The Self-Rating Scale was presented in the "Results" section of this report. Although it was developed to reflect an empirical data base and was subjected to inspection and critical analysis by consultants representing theorist and practitioner viewpoints, the Self-Rating Scale has yet to be validated by a process of field testing under controlled conditions. Therefore, a specific recommendation is that this instrument be field tested using a statistically adequate sample of comprehensive secondary schools and area vocational-technical schools in order to establish:

1. whether or not the instrument actually does discriminate between (a) vocational programs that do provide a reasonable degree of access to disadvantaged students and (b) vocational programs that provide little access to disadvantaged programs (validity).
2. whether or not the SRS is usable for school needs assessment purposes (design efficiency).
3. whether or not the SRS produces consistent scores over repeated use (reliability).

Once field tested, and modified as necessary, the Self-Rating Scale might well provide a basis for program monitoring by various state departments of education to insure that "disadvantaged setaside" funds are used appropriately.

Summary

The descriptive study conducted by the Grantee and described in this final report generally found that the two most significant obstacles to vocational program access for the disadvantaged are (1) the lack of vocational education facilities and resources, which produces an oversubscription condition, which in turn effectively serves to deny services to the educationally disadvantaged, and (2) the lack of guidance services to provide comprehensive and accurate vocational information to disadvantaged students. A number of "success factors" were identified (and described in this report), but until the two obstacles cited above can be effectively removed, equal access will probably remain a myth despite legislature mandates and the most energetic compliance monitoring efforts. Accordingly, the Grantee strongly

recommends on the basis of this study, that U.S.O.E. support be focused upon research projects and demonstration programs which are addressed to (1) alternative approaches--such as more evening courses, use of mobile units, and alternative curricula--to expand vocational education facilities and resources, and (2) cost-efficient methods of delivering vocational-related information to disadvantaged students.

In addition, it was determined, on the basis of project results, that there may be considerable discrepancy between (1) what vocational educators agree is needed to improve access for the disadvantaged, and (2) what vocational educators do to improve access, even when cost does not appear to be an obstacle.

Therefore, the Grantee recommends that further study be conducted to determine the degree of discrepancy that may exist and <u>why</u> any discrepancy should exist at all. Finally, it is suggested that it may be of interest to directly assess disadvantaged <u>student</u> attitudes implied in various student-related items in the obstacle/equal access rating scale. Comparisons may then be made between (1) what students say about their attitudes and (2) what vocational educators say about student attitudes.

REFERENCES

Cohen, Eli E. and Seldin, Joel. Unemployed youth and depressed area schools. In A. Harry Passow (Ed.), *Reaching the Disadvantaged.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.

Donovan, Russell. School programs: the basis of choice. *Career Commentary.* Cornell Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education. Vol. III, No. 6, 1974.

Feldman, Marvin J. Public education and manpower development. In A. Harry Passow (Ed.), *Reaching the Disadvantaged.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.

Meade, Edward J., Jr. Vocational and technical education for disadvantaged youth: a critical look. In A. Harry Passow (Ed.), *Developing Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1968.

Parsons, Edgar, Hughes, James H., and Rice, Eric. *Assessment of Needs in Programs of Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged and Handicapped.* Chapel Hill, North Carolina: System Sciences Incorporated, 1975.

Passow, A. Harry (Ed.). *Education in Depressed Areas.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1963.

Phillips, C.V. Diversity of special groups: description and needs. In Wall (Ed.), *Vocational Education for Special Groups.* Washington, D.C.: The American Vocational Association, 1976.

Phillips, L., Carmel, L., and Renzullo, R. *Barriers and Bridges.* Sacramento, CA: California Advisory Council on Vocational Education, 1977.

Prediger, Dale J., Roth, John J., and Noeth, Richard J. *Nationwide Study of Student Career Development: Summary of Results.* American College Testing Program, Report No. 61, November, 1973.

Walsh, J., and Totten, J.L. *An Assessment of Vocational Education Programs for the Disadvantaged Under Part B and Part A Section 102(6) of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act.* Salt Lake City, UT: Olympus Research Corporation, 1976.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, V.L., and Greenberger, D.B. An aesthetic theory of school vandalism. *Theoretical Perspectives on School Crime, Volume I.* National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Hackensack, NJ. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, February 1978, Grant Number HEW-100-76-0132, 11-72, PB-279530.

Borg, W.R. and Gall, M.D. *Educational Research.* New York: David McKay Co., 1971 (2nd Edition).

Clark, A.K. Readability of industrial education textbooks. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education.* 1978, 16 (1), 13-23.

Coleman, J.W. Deviant subcultures and the schools, theoretical perspectives on school crime. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education.* 1978, 16 (1), 163-191.

Gottlieb, D. and Petty, R. Winners and losers in the good life contest: implications of career education for poor youth. In Lawrence Davenport and Reginald Petty (Eds.), *Minorities and Career Education.* ECCA Publications, January 1973, 53-68.

Gagne', E.E. Educating delinquents: a review of research. *The Journal of Special Education.* 1977, 11 (1), 13-27.

Kumar, V. *Handicapped Persons in Wisconsin's Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education Districts: Assessment of Educational Techniques and Identification of Barriers. (Part of Program Evaluation and Planning, PEP).* Grant Number G007604416, Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin, 1977.

Loeb, Rita. Cumulative and exploratory delinquency. *Theoretical Perspectives on School Crime, Volume I.* National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Hackensack, NJ. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, February 1978, Grant Number HEW-100-76-0132, 145-172, PB-279530.

Mainprize, D. and Mann, P. Educating adolescents with emotional and delinquency problems. *The Clearing House.* 1977, 50, May, 403-405.

Miller, W.B. Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues.* 1958, 14, 5-19.

New Jersey Department of Education. *New Jersey State Plan for Vocational Education.* 1976-77.

100 Special Needs Programs, National Association of Vocational Educational Special Needs Personnel. Paterson, NJ: Employment Orientation Programs, 1975.

Phillips, J.C. The creation of deviant behavior in American high schools. *Theoretical Perspectives on School Crime, Volume I.* National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Hackensack, NJ. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, February 1978, Grant Number HEW-100-76-0132, 979-1038, PB-279530.

Powell, W.C. Educational intervention as a preventive measure. *Criminal Justice and Behavior.* December 1975, 2 (4), 392-407.

Rahav, G. Juvenile delinquency as minority crime. *Adolescence.* Winter 1977, 13 (48), 471-475.

Richardson, C., and Meyer, R.G. Techniques in guided group interaction programs. *Child Welfare.* October 1972, 51 (8), 519-527.

Savitz, L.D., Lalli, M., and Rosen, L. The fear of school-based crimes and rational responses. *Theoretical Perspectives on School Crime, Volume I.* National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Hackensack, NJ. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, February 1978, Grant Number HEW-100-76-0132, 226-247.

U.S. Department of Labor. *The Manpower Report of the President, 1975.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

Wall, James E. (Ed.). *Vocational Education for Special Groups: Sixth yearbook of the American Vocational Association.* Washington, D.C.: The American Vocational Association, 1976.

Weisman, L. Identification, recruitment, and retention of persons in programs for special groups. In Wall (Ed.), *Vocational Education for Special Groups.* Washington, D.C.: The American Vocational Association, 1976.

York, E.G. (Ed.). *Helping Educationally Disadvantaged Students Through Vocational Education.* Trenton, NJ: New Jersey State Department of Education.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS

INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES IN PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name of School _____

2. Current Enrollment: _____ Male _____ Female

3. Estimated % Disadvantaged _____

4. Estimated % Minority Disadvantaged _____

5. Your Present Status? ____ Faculty ____ Supervisor
____ Other Specify _____

6. Have you taught disadvantaged students? ___Yes ___No

7. Are you now teaching disadvantaged students?
___Yes ___No

8. What do you need to improve your teaching services to the disadvantaged?

(List and describe) _____

_____

_____

_____

9. What does your school need to improve its services to the disadvantaged?

(List and describe) _____

_____

_____

_____

CIRCLE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CHOICES FOR EACH STATEMENT:

NB - No Basis for Opinion

SA - Strongly Agree

A - Agree

D - Disagree

SD - Strongly Disagree

B. SUCCESSFUL TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The statements listed below were identified by persons working with disadvantaged students as techniques that may be successful in educating these individuals. Please indicate the level at which you agree or disagree with these statements or indicate if you have no basis for an opinion due to lack of knowledge or experience with these techniques.

1. Disadvantaged students are successfully taught in vocational programs through the use of techniques and materials specially adapted to meet their needs such as:

a. Individualized instruction	NB	SA	A	D	SD
b. Peer tutoring	NB	SA	A	D	SD
c. "Hands-on" experiences	NB	SA	A	D	SD
d. Behavior modification methods . . .	NB	SA	A	D	SD
e. Competency-based instruction	NB	SA	A	D	SD
f. Field trips	NB	SA	A	D	SD
g. Commercially prepared audio-visual materials	NB	SA	A	D	SD
h. Commercially prepared printed materials	NB	SA	A	D	SD
i. Teacher-made audio and/or visual materials	NB	SA	A	D	SD
j. Teacher-made printed materials . . .	NB	SA	A	D	SD
k. Student therapy or group counseling sessions	NB	SA	A	D	SD
l. Special counselors and individual counseling	NB	SA	A	D	SD

m. Buddy systems	NB	SA	A	D	SD
n. Remedial instruction related to shop experiences	NB	SA	A	D	SD
o. Home-school counselors	NB	SA	A	D	SD
p. Teacher aides to support instruction	NB	SA	A	D	SD
q. Mastery Learning (No time limits). .	NB	SA	A	D	SD

2. *Disadvantaged Students are successfully RECRUITED for Vocational programs through:*

a. Personal contacts by past students and acquaintances	NB	SA	A	D	SD
b. Public awareness by printed and broadcast media	NB	SA	A	D	SD
c. Personal contact during home visits	NB	SA	A	D	SD
d. Referral by guidance counselors and/or school	NB	SA	A	D	SD
e. Visits to sending schools by Vocational School staff and students .	NB	SA	A	D	SD
f. Advertisements sent to parents . .	NB	SA	A	D	SD
g. Community organizations	NB	SA	A	D	SD

3. *Disadvantaged students are successfully EVALUATED through:*

a. Psychometric testing	NB	SA	A	D	SD
b. Teacher evaluation	NB	SA	A	D	SD
c. Work evaluation	NB	SA	A	D	SD
d. Counselor interpretation of tests .	NB	SA	A	D	SD
e. Personal interview with counselor .	NB	SA	A	D	SD

C. BARRIERS TO ENROLLMENT AND SUCCESS IN VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The statements listed below were identified by persons working with disadvantaged students as barriers that prevent these students

from enrolling and succeeding in vocational programs. Please indicate the level at which you agree or disagree with these barrier statements or indicate if you have no basis for an opinion due to lack of knowledge or experience with these barriers.

1. *Disadvantaged Students are prevented from enrolling in vocational programs because of:*

a. Their poor self image	NB	SA	A	D	SD
b. Their lack of confidence	NB	SA	A	D	SD
c. Their fear of trying	NB	SA	A	D	SD
d. Their hostile attitude	NB	SA	A	D	SD
e. Their fear of accepting responsibility	NB	SA	A	D	SD
f. Their fear of opposing family wishes	NB	SA	A	D	SD
g. Their poor work attitudes	NB	SA	A	D	SD
h. Their poor attendance	NB	SA	A	D	SD
i. Their unrealistic expectations compared to actual abilities . . .	NB	SA	A	D	SD
j. Their lack of interest in any vocational programs	NB	SA	A	D	SD
k. Their lack of information about vocational programs and employment possibilities	NB	SA	A	D	SD
l. Their belief that vocational education offers training for menial or low level jobs	NB	SA	A	D	SD
m. Employers' prejudice	NB	SA	A	D	SD
n. Teachers' prejudice	NB	SA	A	D	SD
o. Students' prejudice	NB	SA	A	D	SD
p. Attitude that government support is better than working for low wages	NB	SA	A	D	SD
q. Union opposition to hiring of minorities and/or disadvantaged . .	NB	SA	A	D	SD

r. Teacher fear that not enough time is available to adequately serve disadvantaged students	NB	SA	A	D	SD
s. Teacher fear of watering down courses for disadvantaged students	NB	SA	A	D	SD
t. Teacher fear that disadvantaged students would be discipline problems	NB	SA	A	D	SD

2. *Disadvantaged Students are prevented from succeeding in vocational programs because:*

a. They do not complete assignments on time	NB	SA	A	D	SD
b. They lack interest in class	NB	SA	A	D	SD
c. They are easily frustrated with their rate of progress in acquiring skill	NB	SA	A	D	SD
d. They lack motivation	NB	SA	A	D	SD
e. They cannot adjust to class discipline	NB	SA	A	D	SD
f. They have a high rate of absenteeism	NB	SA	A	D	SD
g. They have attained low academic achievement	NB	SA	A	D	SD
h. They are unable to perform well in their preferred vocational area . .	NB	SA	A	D	SD
i. They have health problems	NB	SA	A	D	SD
j. Teachers are unwilling or unable to provide extra time and effort for disadvantaged students	NB	SA	A	D	SD
k. Teachers become discouraged at students' rate of progress	NB	SA	A	D	SD
l. Strained relationships exist between disadvantaged students and other class members	NB	SA	A	D	SD

m. Remedial instruction is not effective	NB	SA	A	D	SD
n. Printed materials are difficult to read	NB	SA	A	D	SD
o. Audio/visual materials are difficult to comprehend	NB	SA	A	D	SD
p. There is a lack of school finances to acquire materials in multiple modes and levels, support services, and aides	NB	SA	A	D	SD

INTERVIEW-QUESTIONNAIRE

School _____

Principal or Counselor _____ Date _____

Baseline Enrollment Figures (use attached form) _____

1. Are your programs generally over or under subscribed?

_____

_____

Is this true of all programs? (Specify programs and years.)

_____

_____

2. How do you decide which students, of those applying, should be admitted
a) to the school? _____

_____

b) to specific programs? _____

_____

3. Is an interview required for admission? (If the response is "Yes", probe.)

_____

_____

Must adult accompany applicant to the interview? (probe)

_____

_____

What qualities are important for success? How do you determine this during the interview? (Probe for descriptions of attitudes and interests of prospective students.)

_____

_____

_____

4. What kinds of tests are given? How are these scores used?

5. How important are the applicants' reading and mathematics scores? (Note range of scores and shop placements.)

6. How important is an applicant's previous school record?
a) attendance?

b) conduct? (behavior problems)

c) grades and test scores?

7. Concerning the results of the interview, tests, previous school records--are there mitigating or extenuating circumstances? That is, would you accept a minority student with a poor attendance record, an indifferent or hostile attitude, inadequate skills, etc.? Admit to all programs? (probe)

8. What difficulties might (or have) you encounter(ed) in attempting to meet the needs of students characterized as disadvantaged and displaying some or all of the characteristics previously discussed (question 7).

9. How are difficult and/or dangerous youngsters handled? Special arrangements? Counseling? Therapy? Expulsion? (probe)

10. Does your school offer special remedial mathematics, English, reading, etc. for students with skills and language problems? As part of their vocational courses? At special times--i.e. in the area of math or reading only? Special tutors available? Is a buddy system used? Probe for evidence of articulation between regular reading and mathematics instruction and vocational training? Probe for problems in these areas.

11. What happens when a student falls behind in the demands of a particular shop? Transfer? Special help?

12. Is the student allowed to progress at his or her own rate? Is it possible to take more than the usual amount of time to finish a particular training program?

13. Do students change shops? Why?

Dropout? Why?

14. How do students find out about your program?

15. If school visits are mentioned, inquire about recruitment strategies--e.g. are films used? who makes the visits? are minority members present? how many visits are made? when? who attends? how are the students who attend recruitment sessions informed or selected? number attending?

16. Are students interested in recruitment presentations? particularly women and minority students? (Why are there still relatively few women [in "male" occupations] and minority applicants? probe.)

17. Are students referred through guidance counselors?

18. What information is given to guidance counselors and teachers about the kind of vocational programs available?

19. Do you advertise? _____ Where? _____ Use the media? _____ (Samples)

20. How many students presently enrolled have had relatives or friends who attended this school and/or program? _____ How many indicate that they have friends or relatives presently attending? _____ Could this have influenced their decision to attend? Or not attend?

21. Do blacks, hispanics, boys, and/or girls tend to take similar courses--i.e. cluster or group together?

_____

_____

22. Sports offered? Have students indicated their preference for a nonvocational high school because of sports program? Social activities?

_____

_____

23. How many graduates continue their education? _____ College? _____ Technical? _____ Are college preparatory courses offered? _____ What must students do if they wish to prepare for college?

_____

24. Have you encountered special problems in placing minorities and/or women in jobs?

_____

_____

Probe - note minorities often perceive that they face discrimination from unions and small companies or businesses. Also they fear that they may be hired on a quota basis and refused employment if the quota is filled.

_____

_____

_____

25. What opportunities are available for students not enrolled in the regular vocational program to complete training in the various shops? _____ Twilight tech? _____ Enrollment? _____ Over or under subscribed? _____ If under-subscribed, probe. _____

_____

_____

If over-subscribed, inquire about admissions policies _____

_____

_____

26. Inquire if principal and/or counselor has any suggestions for improving enrollments of women and minorities in a variety of vocational fields. Also, ask for feedback on responses from minorities and women on attitudes towards vocational training.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

INSERVICE MATERIALS

CONFERENCE ON EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR WORKING WITH DELINQUENTS AND DROPOUTS

Department of Vocational-Technical Education
The Graduate School of Education
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

January 11 and 12, 1979

RUTGERS
THE STATE UNIVERSITY
OF NEW JERSEY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION • DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION
NEW BRUNSWICK • NEW JERSEY 08903 • 201/932-7937

THURSDAY AND FRIDAY
JANUARY 11 and 12, 1979
AT
Educational Improvement Center-Central
3684 U.S. Route 1 (Bldg. #1)
Princeton, New Jersey

CONFERENCE ON EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR WORKING WITH DELINQUENTS AND DROPOUTS

PROGRAM SCHEDULE — Thursday, January 11, 1979

9:00 a.m. — Opening Remarks
Welcome - Dr. Annell Simcoe, Chairperson, Department of Vocational-Technical Education, Rutgers University.
Introduction - Dr. Catherine Anelli, Project Director, "Equal Access to Vocational Education", Rutgers University.

9:45 a.m. — Developing Constructive Interactions with Small Groups
Mr. Albert Elias, Assistant Commissioner of Policy and Planning, Department of Corrections, Trenton. Formerly Director of Highfields Residential Group Center for Delinquent Boys and Executive Director of N.Y. State Division of Youth. Consultant to the American Correctional Association.

11:45 a.m. — LUNCHEON

1:15 p.m. — Teaching Basic Life Coping Skills
Dr. J.J. Kennedy, Jr., Assistant Director, Research and Development Center for Life Skills and Human Resource Development, Teachers College, Columbia University. Consultant for program development in career and vocational counseling.

3:00 p.m. — ADJOURN

PROGRAM SCHEDULE Friday, January 12, 1979

9:00 a.m. Opening Remarks (Introduction to Program Development for Delinquents)
Ms. Patricia Grant, Director of Educational Services, Middlesex County Workhouse, Middlesex County College. Reading Specialist and Consultant, Scholastic Books.

9:45 a.m. Modifying the Behavior of Delinquency Prone Youngsters
Dr. Charles Diamont, Clinical Psychologist, Children's Psychiatric Center/Community Mental Health Center, Red Bank, New Jersey. Assistant Editor, Child Behavior Therapy.

11:45 a.m. LUNCHEON

1:15 p.m. Planning and Developing Programs for Delinquents and Pre-Delinquent Youth
Workshops and discussion groups with Mr. Albert Elias, Ms. Patricia Grant, and Drs. Kennedy, Diamont, and Anelli.

3:00 p.m. ADJOURN

GUIDED GROUP INTERACTION IN A SCHOOL SETTING

Albert Elias

GUIDED GROUP INTERACTION IN A SCHOOL SETTING

Guided Group Interaction is a well tested and researched methodology developed to change peer group cultures. It is a methodology specifically designed for adolescents. Guided Group Interaction is a dynamic short-term group process which is not to be equated with group counseling, group therapy, encounter groups or sensitivity groups. It utilizes the dynamics and strengths of the existing peer group culture for the purpose of modifying the roles, norms, values and attitudes that are counter productive, while strengthening those which are conducive to the student's social and academic development. Guided Group Interaction views the peer group as a given human resource with potential energy to be tapped and utilized--not suppressed. Through the Process of Guided Group Interaction, the group can explore alternative ways of perceiving the school environment and behaving within it.

As a result of the Guided Group Interaction experience, educational achievement is enhanced; effective interpersonal skills in relating to administrators, teachers and other students are learned; students develop greater autonomy; and the potential for personal growth is encouraged. Subsequently, students develop into contributing members of the academic environment. In addition, the group also has a great impact in bringing about change in the larger student body. The implementation of Guided Group Interaction in the school system is designed to support administrative and classroom procedures as well as supplement existing programs of guidance and counseling.

GUIDED GROUP INTERACTION
BASIC STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS

Guided Group Interaction is a treatment intervention that is used extensively throughout the country. When used properly, it is a most powerful and effective change strategy. Not only does it have great impact on individuals, it also brings about desirable change throughout the organization. One result of guided group interaction is the development of a positive peer-group culture. Below is a brief list of dimensions that define guided group interaction structurally. This list is not meant to be exhaustive or fully explanatory. The intent is to describe those basic elements that define guided group interaction and therefore separate it from other group strategies. This list should help those people who are conducting guided group interaction groups as well as those people who are conducting groups and who may not know that they are using guided group interaction.

1. The group leader, for the most part, sits outside of the group which is composed of 8 to 12 members seated in a circle or semi-circle.

2. The group leader's role is to help the group members develop a helping relationship with each other. The role of the group leader is not to develop a therapeutic relationship with each member of the group.

3. A basic theme of guided group interaction is that you "get helped by giving help."

4. Group meetings are held anywhere from three to five times per week. Five meetings per week, one per day, is standard.

5. Group meetings last anywhere from one hour to an hour and a half.

6. The group and the group meeting are considered the most important aspect of the youth's program. Meetings are not canceled or cut short.

7. During the group meeting, one person is the object of the group's discussion for the entire meeting time.

8. The group identifies problem areas which members think are important to be solved before a member is considered helped. The labels used to identify the problem areas become the group's common language (i.e., light-finger problem, small feelings, authority problem, easily-influenced problem, etc.), all of which are and have been used at Highfields, New Jersey since 1951.

9. The group gives each member the problems that he or she must solve. The group takes away problems as the members solve them. The entire group must agree that the person solved his or her problems and there must be behavioral evidence.

10. The group meeting process is typically as follows: Member Review of Problems ----→ Group Decides Who Gets the Meeting ----→ Analysis and Solutions to Problem ----→ Group Leader Summary.

11. The group leader's major source of input is during the summary that he or she gives at the end of the meeting. Usually a maximum of ten minutes is used for the summary. The summary is essentially feedback to the group on the content and work style of the meeting. During the meeting, the group leader guides the interaction and the summary is a synthesis of the results of the meeting.

12. Group members have the responsibility to help each other outside of the group meeting time. Therefore, group members must be scheduled in the program together. The optimum is scheduling the entire group together. The minimum requirement is scheduling at least three members together in program (i.e., school, work, recreation, etc.).

13. The goal of the group meetings is to help each member. This is achieved through a positive peer-group culture which results from the guided group interaction process.

14. An important aspect of the guided group interaction process is that each group has legitimate power to assist in making decisions within the organization. The scope and significance of the group's decision making involvement is contingent on the members helping each other. The group's decision making capacity exists on two levels: 1) deciding the treatment objectives for each member and how to accomplish these, and 2) making such official decisions such as member readiness for home visits, off-grounds, release, etc.

15. The group's main objective is to help, not hurt. The group does not get involved in making any decisions that result in members getting punished. The development of a positive peer-group culture is not achieved through group harassment but through group concern and care.

WHY DOES IT WORK?

A theoretical perspective is that all youth have been socialized in such a manner that they are aware of conventional standards, and that they are extremely ambivalent about their unconventional behavior. Youth maintain numerous rationalizations to neutralize their ambivalence. This ambivalence, through Guided Group Interaction, is used as a vehicle for effecting change. Guided Group Interaction clearly differentiates between conventional and counter productive alternatives. This leads youth to question the utility of their present behavior and to perceive and test out for themselves the value of conventional alternatives with support from peers.

In Guided Group Interaction, there are two crucial elements necessary to support the exploration of alternative behaviors that are consistent with the goals of the school.

1. The group experience must be regarded as a significant aspect of the youth's daily experiences. This occurs when the group is coordinated with other aspects of the school program.

2. The sharing of organizational authority with the peer group as it changes and develops responsibility is critical. The creative sharing of authority aids in the development of a positive pro social peer group. The importance of implied and real threats to bring about group change is eliminated. What is essential is that the group share the responsibility of making critical decisions concerning its members, development, and its role in the school organization.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

The public school--a complex organization--has multiple goals to accomplish. The most central goal is to prepare the student for adult life through a well developed academic curriculum and planned activities that aid in the continued social development of the student.

In order for a school to effectively meet its goal it is necessary that the students also accept and become committed to accomplishing these goals. Frequently, there develops in schools a student, peer group culture that is counter productive to academic achievement and appropriate social development.

One very visible consequence of this culture, besides under achievement, is daily behavior problems on the part of individual students. As a result, considerable staff time is spent in dealing with the individual student as the problem. In reality, inappropriate behavior on the part of the individual student is directly related to the norms and values of the student peer group culture. A more appropriate solution is to change the student subculture which is contrary to and subverts the desired student culture.

SCHOOL YOUTH ADVOVACY PROJECT--EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

At present, there are four Michigan school districts--Waverly, Menominee, Lansing and Bellaire--involved in the School Youth Advocacy Project, a highly innovative project funded under E.S.E.A. Title III grants, which consists of

local, state and federal funding. The scope of this project is directly related to and designed to have an impact upon the Common Goals of Michigan Education which are:

1. Citizenship and morality
2. Democracy and equal opportunity
3. Student learning.

The project also addresses the results of the E.S.E.A. Title III Needs Assessment conducted during May and June, 1972 for the Michigan Department of Education by the Research, Evaluation and Assessment Service Unit:

"• There is a need for programs which will help children and youth learn to peacefully live and work with people of different ethnic and minority groups.

• There is a need for programs which will help prevent juvenile delinquency or rehabilitate young people who have come into conflict with the law.

• There is a need for new and innovative programs for the potential school dropout to provide him with a meaningful alternative to leaving school.

• There is a need for new, innovative approaches to education at all academic levels which will be more effective than the present methodologies and materials and which will result in at least a more efficient way of doing things and hopefully will result in greater efficiency plus added student learning."

It is a project with a comprehensive research component which will provide evidence to determine the extent to which the behavior of the participants has been improved. The School Youth Advocacy Project has been set up to demonstrate alternative

methods to assist schools in coping with student related problems confronted daily.

PROGRESS AND RESULTS

The project was implemented at the end of October, 1973. At present there are seventy students involved in the Guided Group Interaction component of the School Youth Advocacy Project. These students, both boys and girls, were selected to be involved in the project based on their leadership characteristics and ability to influence other students. They meet in peer groups of ten students each, on a daily basis for approximately one hour. They are actively involved in dynamic group discussions focusing on problems encountered by the group members each day in the school setting. They are working actively to solve and prevent these problems. Some of the issues which the groups confront daily in open discussion are truancy, skipping class, insubordination, drugs, smoking, drinking, academic underachievement, lack of self respect and self esteem, concern for others, and cooperative relationships with adults and peers.

Already there is evidence of change on the part of group members as well as evidence that the groups are having an impact on other students. All youth involved in these groups are committed to the process and the goals of the group.

A few of the many interesting developments that highlight the students' acceptance and commitment are:

- "A student who has quit school got himself reinstated so that he could participate in the group."
- "In the beginning of the project students who were absent from school showed up for group meeting at the end of the day."
- "Some group members in one group take it upon themselves to stop at the home of one group member who was consistently truant to insure that he attends school."
- "One group decided to accompany a member to all of his classes to guarantee his attendance."
- "A group was responsible for getting a student who is not a member of the group to return property that he stole."

BASIC LIFE COPING SKILLS

J.J. Kennedy

TEACHING BASIC LIFE COPING SKILLS THROUGH THE USE OF A FOUR STAGE, PROBLEM-CENTERED, STRUCTURED INQUIRY LEARNING MODEL

I. Life Coping Skills: Major Curriculum Tracks and Representative Units

   A. Difference between Adult Performance Level Model of Functional Competency (Northcutt) and Life Coping Skills (Adkins)

   B. Role and limitations of counseling in helping individuals acquire psycho-social skills

II. The Adkins Four Stage Life Skills Model

III. Career Development and Career Counseling

   A. Parson's Paradigm of Vocational (Career) Counseling

   B. Super's Stages of Vocational (Career) Development

   C. Behavioral Goals of the Exploration Stage of Vocational (Career) Development

IV. The Employability Skills Series, Adkins Life Skills Program

LIFE COPING SKILLS*

MAJOR CURRICULUM TRACKS AND REPRESENTATIVE UNITS

TRACKS	REPRESENTATIVE UNITS
PREPARING FOR A CAREER	Inventorying interests and abilities. Exploring relevant job families. Selecting educational experiences. Presenting oneself effectively in a job interview. Developing personal criteria for evaluating good and bad jobs.
DEVELOPING ONESELF	Planning one's time. Getting help with personal problems. Dealing with rejection, self-discipline. Keeping balance in one's life. Determining weaknesses and strengths.
RELATING TO OTHERS	Resolving conflicts. Dealing with intimacy. Dealing with the public. Listening effectively. Expressing anger and disagreement. Giving and taking orders. Identifying and avoiding barriers to communication. Relating to an employer.
PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT AND HEALTH	Making decisions about drugs, alcohol, and smoking (Prevention, Coping, Getting help.) Exercise and nutrition. Occupational health hazards. Physical appearance and non-verbal communication.
USING LEISURE TIME EFFECTIVELY	Participative vs. spectator activities. Changing mood and pace through recreation. Using cultural resources. Supplementing work satisfactions through leisure.

*from Adkins, "Life Coping Skills: A Fifth Curriculum," Teachers College Record, May, 1974.

TRACKS	REPRESENTATIVE UNITS
MANAGING HOME AND FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES	Resolving conflicts with parents and siblings. Dealing with different stages of courtship and marriage. Buying and budgeting. Planning children. The interrelationship of work and family responsibilities.
EXERCISING ONE'S RIGHTS OPPORTUNITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE COMMUNITY	Selecting a community. What to do if arrested. Getting information from newspapers and TV. Giving and getting support and help in your community. Dealing with racial or sex discrimination.

OVERVIEW OF THE FOUR-STAGE LIFE SKILLS MODEL*

OBJECTIVES			
STIMULUS	EVOCATION	OBJECTIVE INQUIRY	APPLICATION
-focus attention of group	-evoke responses from all group members	-aid inquiry into what is known by others	-apply knowledge to -aspects of problems to acquire skills
-stimulate group to respond	-demonstrate knowledge already acquired and dignify the learner	-help find and use resources	-broaden experience
-frame problem	-enhance group rapport	-help discover new sources of knowledge	-feel success in coping effectively
	-categorize group knowledge	-help test current assumptions about knowledge	
	-raise curiosity	-incorporate previous and new knowledge and experience	

ROLE OF LIFE SKILLS EDUCATOR**			
STIMULATOR	EVOCATEUR	RESOURCE PERSON	SHAPER AND COACH
-prepare and present stimulus	-ask questions and lead discussion to elicit what group already knows	-suggest sources of knowledge	-help learners to frame and carry out projects
	-record group responses	-provide resources	-help judge performance
	-help group categorize knowledge and raise questions	-assist learners in using resources and making presentations	-encourage the learner
		-conduct discussions to assimilate what has been learned	

*from Adkins, "Life Coping Skills: A Fifth Curriculum," Teachers College Record, May, 1974.

**in addition to the above, the life skills educator may conduct regular individual counseling sessions at various times.

ROLE OF LEARNER			
STIMULATOR -respond to stimulus	EVOCATEUR -discuss what each knows and feels about problem	RESOURCE PERSON -make inquiries to obtain knowledge using multimedia kit -present findings to group	SHAPER AND COACH -define, select, and carry out individual team and group projects
MATERIALS FOR LESSONS			
-films, clippings, pictures, stories experience with high emotional impact	-flip chart, magic marker	-multimedia kit of pamphlets, films, recordings, suggested trips	-selected, prepared projects and suggested project types
DURATION			
-until discussion starts	-as long as group can still produce ideas and is interested	-as long as group wants to know and what others know	-until mastery is achieved

STAGES OF VOCATIONAL (CAREER) DEVELOPMENT*

1. Growth Stage (Birth to 14 years):	A period of general physical and mental growth.
a. Prevocational Substage (Birth to 3):	No interest or concern with vocations or vocational choice.
b. Fantasy Substage (4-10):	Fantasy is basis of vocational thinking.
c. Interest Substage (11-12):	Vocational thought is based on the individual's likes and dislikes.
d. Capacity Substage (13-14):	Ability becomes the basis for vocational thought.
2. Exploration Stage (15-24 years):	General exploration of work
a. Tentative Substage (15-17):	Needs interests, capacities, values, and opportunities become basis for tentative occupational decisions.
b. Transition Substage (18-21):	Reality increasingly becomes a basis for vocational thought and action.
c. Trial Substage (22-24):	First trial job is entered after the individual has made an initial vocational commitment.
3. Establishment Stage (25-44 years):	The individual seeks to enter a permanent occupation.
a. Trial (25-30):	A period of some occupational changes due to unsatisfactory choices.
b. Stabilization (31-44):	A period of stable work in a given occupation field.
4. Maintenance Stage (45 to 65 years):	Continuation in one's chosen occupation.

*from Super, Donald E., The Psychology of Careers, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

5. Decline Stage (65 years to death):

a. Deceleration (65-70)	A period of declining vocational activity.
b. Retirement (71 on):	A cessation of vocational activity.

Behavioral Goals of the Exploration Stages of Vocational (Career) Development*

1. Increasing concern with vocational choice
2. Crystallization of traits relevant to vocational choice
   a. Ability to verbalize one's own strengths and weaknesses
   b. Accuracy of self-appraisal, in terms of evidence derived from multiple sources
3. Increasing amount of vocational information
   a. Knowledge of various curricula and their relationship to occupational plans
   b. Knowledge of secondary school courses which would contribute to successful performance of the occupational choice
4. Increasing consistency of vocational choice
5. More comprehensive and detailed planning
6. Increasing wisdom of vocational preference
   a. Knowledge of own interests and values and those required by the occupation chosen
   b. The degree to which the choice was developed independently.

*Adapted from Ginzberg, Ginsburg, Axelrod, and Herma, Occupational Choice. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951, and Gribbons and Lohnes, Emerging Careers. New York: Teachers College Press, 1968.

EMPLOYABILITY SKILLS SERIES
ADKINS LIFE SKILLS PROGRAM

Unit 1. Who I am and Where I want to Go

Unit 2. Ten Occupational Fields: How do I explore them?

Unit 3. Jobs and Training: Beginning the search

Unit 4. Employment Agencies and Personal Contacts

Unit 5. Choosing A Good Job for Myself

Unit 6. Planning for Personal goals

Unit 7. Developing a Vocational Plan

Unit 8. Looking Good on Paper

Unit 9. The Job interview: How to be effective

Unit 10. Keeping my job: Habits that Help

PLANNING AND DEVELOPING PROGRAMS FOR DELINQUENTS AND PRE-DELINQUENT YOUTH

Patricia Grant

SITUATIONS CONTRIBUTING TO SCHOOL ALIENATION AND/OR DROPOUT

- Consistent failure at school tasks
- Prejudgement by teachers
- Early addiction to drugs--especially alcohol
- Poor teacher/administrator control leading to little or no discipline
- Lack of physical safety in school or on school grounds
- Lack of psychological safety in schoolroom, i.e., ridicule by teachers or other students
- Lack of structure in both discipline and schoolwork
- Automatic accusation by staff whenever rule infractions took place
- Alienation of student, i.e., no real sense of being connected in any way. Examples of this include no participation in sports, school clubs, academic work, etc.
- Embarrassment over poor looking clothing or lack of several changes of clothing, i.e., one pair of dungarees to wear to school for an entire year
- Sense that staff really <u>didn't care</u> what happened with individual student. In short, high student need for individual attention
- Fear of revealing themselves--their vulnerability and/or sensitivity especially towards criticism or failure (A classic example of this is the student who won't study for a test and, therefore, fails the test. If he does study for a test and fails it, then he has to admit that he failed. If he doesn't study then, paradoxically, he doesn't have to admit that he is a failure.)
- Fear of revealing how much they don't know, which in the student's mind reveals his/her "stupidity"
- Need to rebel. Then, after the rebellion takes place, it is handled poorly by those in authority.

CHARACTERISTICS OF DELINQUENT AND PRE-DELINQUENT YOUTH

- Withdrawal
- Reluctance to do schoolwork, especially composition, math, or reading
- Hostility, especially toward authority figures
- Fear (However, said fear may resemble a cocky kind of bravado.)
- Silence
- Manipulation in the sense that these students try to avoid doing work by talking with the teacher or getting some other kind of discussion session going
- Extreme sensitivity, i.e., terrible hurt if the student thinks that the teacher is angry with him/her. (However, the student is not likely to admit feeling hurt.)
- Strong dependence on the teacher
- Inability to flex when there is any kind of change, i.e., new teacher, new schedule, new approaches, new students, etc.
- Deep suspicion of teacher and teacher's motivation
- Constant testing of teacher and teacher's ground rules/ guidelines
- Impulsive
- Stunted reasoning/poor judgement. (Student doesn't think ahead to the logical consequence of his/her behavior.)
- Lack of realistic thinking and/or setting of goals. An example of this would be the 90 I.Q. student who wants to be a brain surgeon.

UNORTHODOX APPROACHES FOR UNORTHODOX STUDENTS

I. Psychomotor/Physiological Needs Deficiency/Problem	Traditional Response	Adapted Technique/ Approach/Response
A. General health--nutrition, drug addiction, etc.	Have nurse check for immunizations.	Examine students, even very young ones for addiction, especially alcohol, child abuse, etc.
B. Eyes (visual problems) 1. Visual acuity a. Far-sighted b. Near-sighted	Do cursory eye check with Snellen eye chart. (Snellen eye chart reveals whether student is near-sighted or not. Does not identify a far-sighted child who needs to be identified.)	Use telebinocular if possible. Use informal techniques, if above is not possible. (Informal techniques can be explained or shown later if interest is shown.)
2. Binocular coordination a. "Wall eyed" b. "Cross eyed" c. One eye turns outward or inward.		
3. Visual discrimination (Failure to discriminate different shapes, sizes, rotations, etc. from one another.)		

Deficiency/Problem	Traditional Response	Adapted Technique/ Approach/Response
C. Ears (Auditory problems)	Do quick check with audiometer, if the school has one.	Use audiometer.
1. Auditory acuity (Can't hear sounds, in general from a distance.)		Do auditory discrimination tests. (Examples are available, if interest is shown.)
2. Auditory discrimination (Can't discriminate sounds which sound alike, i.e., p and b, e and i, etc.)		
D. Handwriting	Very little is being done now in the way of handwriting practice which constitutes consistent, regular practice especially for the reason of improving handwriting.	Set up regular schedules and have consistent evaluation of handwriting alone.
1. Poor		See Peck Test for an evaluation method.
2. Lacks proportion, rhythm, readability, etc.		
II. Safety Needs		
A. Physical Safety		
1. Lack of physical safety in school or on school grounds.	React to student rebellion by applying more rigid rules.	Student consistently experiences the logical consequences for his/her actions, i.e., if he/she damages anything then he/she must repair damages or pay to have them repaired.
2. Lack of consistent discipline within a given framework.	Reinforce negative behavior, i.e., give attention only when student is acting out.	Reinforce behavior that you want, not behavior that you don't want.

Deficiency/Problem	Traditional Response	Adapted Technique/ Approach/Response
B. Psychological Safety		
1. Prejudgement by the teacher.	Assume student is no good and will end up in jail (which is usually what happens).	Accept student where he/she is and work from there.
		Don't read any reports, listen to horror tales, etc. about the students in order to avoid the temptation to prejudge.
2. Ridicule by teachers or other students.	Punish with indicators of failure, i.e., low grades.	Don't use sarcasm or ridicule with any student.
3. Lack of structure in schoolwork.	Continually react to student behavior rather than putting together a plan for teacher's action so that student reacts to teacher behavior.	Give students specific goals to be achieved every day.
		Work should be sequenced and paced such that the student makes his/her goal for the day. Be sensitive to the attention span of the student.
4. Fear of revealing vulnerabilities, sensitivities, or inadequacies.	Failure to keep student confidences.	Be aware that student is sensitive and vulnerable as tough as he/she may seem.
	No plan to help relieve student of his/her fears	Try to change the traditional accouterments of school.

Deficiency/Problem	Traditional Response	Adapted Technique/ Approach/Response
		a. Don't mark with red ink. b. Don't mark only incorrect answers. c. Don't mark wrong answers with x's. Using an arrow pointing to an incorrect answer is just as effective. d. Help student correct all mistakes so that he can eventually have a good or perfect paper. e. Praise frequently (continuous schedule) at first. Then, gradually change praise to an intermittent schedule. f. Deal with students in terms of strengths and weaknesses rather than in terms of grade levels. g. Find out what student does well and have him/her do it.

Deficiency/Problem	Traditional Response	Adapted Technique/ Approach/Response
		h. Display student work in a variety of ways, i.e., bulletin boards, school newspapers, etc. i. Do joint goal setting for achievement of the given goals along specific time lines. Validate student feelings. For instance, if student feels tense or frustrated, maybe this is a perfectly normal reaction to an intolerable situation. If this is true, then, say so.
III. Love/Esteem Deficiencies		
A. Consistent failure	Throw up hands in despair and just hope that the student does not come back again.	Work with very small number, i.e., 8-10 students with one teacher has been shown to be a good ratio with difficult students. Work on an individualized basis, which enables the student to work at his/her own level.

Deficiency/Problem	Traditional Response	Adapted Technique/ Approach/Response
		When workable use flexible grouping plans, but regroup continually. Do not expect the student to fail at anything. (Rosenthall Effect) Reward achievement.
B. Automatic accusation by staff whenever rule infractions took place.	Suspend student "trouble makers."	Check all sides of a story and verify all facts (as much as is possible) before making any accusations.
C. Alienation of the student in the sense that he/she is not connected to school via clubs, academic performance, sports, etc.	Ignore students and fail to find their strengths.	Be "straight" with the student.
D. A sense that the staff really didn't care what happened with individual students. In short, high student need for individual attention.	Ignore student, especially if the student is passive. Send student to the principal. (In effect, do anything to get the student out your class.)	Use student made materials whenever possible in order to teach given concepts, etc. (Example will be given in the discussion and talk.) Be sure to give undivided attention to the student regularly.

TEACHING BASIC SKILLS

I. Reading

A. Traditional Approach: Basal Reading Series plus dittos

The traditional approach to teaching reading has been to use a basal reading series (usually oriented to the middle class) in which great numbers of ditto sheets are used to teach basic skills. Very often the traditional approach to reading puts a great deal of emphasis on the phonics discrimination abilities of the student. This, of course, is difficult for dialect and for ESL (English as a Second Language) students.

B. Problem: Motivation (The student hates books and will do anything, including taking a vow sealed with blood, not to pick up a book.)

C. Solution:

1. Use the Language Experience Approach (LEA)

   a. Student relates an experience.

   b. This experience is then written down and typed by the teacher.

   c. The teacher then goes over any difficult words and may even teach some phonics skills or word analysis skills.

   d. Student then reads the story on his own.

   e. All stories are then bound in a notebook for the student to keep.

NOTE: An adapted approach for uncommunicative students is that you, the teacher, might read to the student, rather than insisting that a student relate an experience to you. The teacher then has the student recall what has been read and types the recall.

2. Student selects books written for high interest with low readability to read on an Uninterrupted Sustained Silent Reading (USSR) basis. This approach calls for straight reading by Everyone, including janitor, teacher, and principal. After the reading period, there are no comprehension questions, no book reports, no tests, etc. The student simply reads for pleasure.

3. Astrology (Very unorthodox, but it works.)

   a. Teacher does a chart for the student.

   b. The student looks up readings which are applicable to him or her. (This is very good for reference skills.)

   c. Student reads about himself based on the readings found above. (From this vocabulary can be taught.)

      Also, if the teacher uses multiple interpretations of one placement, the student is forced to synthesize the main ideas and resolve contradictions. Thus, higher level comprehension skills are taught.

   NOTE: I have had enormous success with this technique.

4. As much as this might hurt one's very soul, cut up books and staple together small units to be done one at a time. (Difficult students usually don't like "thick" anything, unless you're handing out certain kinds of magazines currently popular, but nonetheless not allowed in school.)

5. Draw graphs to show the student's accomplishments.

6. Use little signs and symbols, such as a pointing finger to go forward or a jet to show the student is moving along at "flank speed."

7. Handwrite a comment on <u>every piece</u> of work that the student turns in.

8. Have student tape record children's stories for younger brothers and sisters.

9. Try peer tutoring.

10. Games constitute a way to learn a lot without actively shoving a book in a student's hand. Examples of games which I've had particular success with are:

    a. Perquacky.
    b. Scrabble.
    c. Sentence cubes.
    d. Duplicate Ad-Lib.
    e. Word Master Mind.
    f. Spill and Spell.
    g. Syntactics.
    h. Probe.

II. Mathematics

A. Traditional approach: Textbook plus drills

The traditional approach in mathematics includes drills on number facts plus pushing the student through a given textbook whether he/she knows the previous work or not.

B. Problem: Basic Knowledge

The student often does not know: (1) multiplication tables, (2) tables and graph reading, (3) decimals, (4) percent, and (5) word problem solution. NOTE: Be careful about diagnosing a student as having a math problem on word problem solutions; he/she might have a reading problem.

C. Solutions:

1. Continue using the traditional drills.

2. Give surprise reinforcement drills out of context. For example, right in the middle of a reading session, ask Johnny what 4 x 8 =.

3. Use instruments like the "Little Professor" or teacher made games to continually drill students on number facts.

4. Set up a math challenge corner, and give periodic math challenges.

5. INDIVIDUALIZE.

6. Make flexible, small groupings with students who happen to be in the same place. However, be sure that these groupings change frequently so that the student doesn't get labeled as the proverbial "crow."

7. Use peer tutoring whenever possible. For instance, have John (who has just learned long division) teach Bill long division.

8. Give high interest tasks to do which require math ability, i.e., begin a company. (I'll illustrate this more fully during my talk.)

III. English Language and Composition

A. Traditional Approach: Grammar book plus dittos

The traditional approach to the teaching of English includes pushing the student through a grammar book, first. Then, student learning is promoted by using an enormous number of dittos to practice punctuation and capitalization. English or Language Arts as it is now called also depends heavily on weekly spelling tests and sometimes (rarely) on regular writing assignments.

B. Problem: Basic Knowledge

The student does not know: (1) rules of capitalization and punctuation, (2) spelling and homonyms, (3) what a sentence is, and (4) how to knit sentences together to one cohesive unit. In sum, student prose is usually awkward and tortuous, if the teacher is lucky. Usually, student prose is almost incoherent due to lack of usage knowledge and basic rules of grammar.

Because of the above named problem areas in English, it becomes a major issue to (1) get a writing sample from the student and (2) get the student to write regularly.

C. Solutions

1. To get a writing sample, I promised to do a handwriting analysis of their writing sample. But, the sample had to be long, paragraphed, etc. in order for me to analyze their handwriting.

2. Try diary keeping or free writing periods much like the USSR in reading. Only, the free writing would be to set down their feelings, thoughts, ideas, etc. The teacher can read and respond to these, but he/she should not correct them.

3. From the above writing the teacher can cull spelling and homonym lists as well as note major grammar errors. The teacher can then use these lists for teaching and testing.

4. Use teacher-made games to understand and practice the rules of English.

5. Simulation-games provide practice in reading, writing, speaking, and listening. They have the additional advantage of presenting tasks such that the student "forgets" that he is doing school tasks. (Also, simulation-games can give the student practice in exercising judgement.)

Sample CHALLENGE ASSIGNMENT for Reading

FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS--Can you produce the same drawing as another person doing the same assignment?

VISUALIZATION

Read this description carefully. Then make an outline sketch of what is described. Label each item mentioned. Consider the top of the page as "north."

SUTTON PARK

The Sutton farm nearby was purchased by a real estate company. A sketch appeared in the newspaper showing how this area is to be developed.

The section bordering the east-west highway will be a shopping center. Its buildings will be arranged like a broad H, placed at right angles to the highway. Behind the shopping center will be a housing development laid out in a half-moon design. The five avenues are concentric semicircles. These will be crossed by six streets. All of these thoroughfares will terminate at Park Road which will run east-west along a park at the rear of the whole area.

Within this park will be the elementary school at the western end. East of this will be the playground, eight tennis courts, a basketball court, a swimming pool, and, at the extreme eastern end, a miniature golf course.

The shops in the lower half of the shopping center will face the parking space between the buildings. A pedestrian arcade in the center of the "crossbar" of shops will allow passage between the halves of the shopping district.

Traffic will move in and out of the shopping center at a point midway along the highway. Two other entrances, one at each end of the area, will provide access to the housing development and to the theater. The latter will be located within the space beyond the crossbar of shops. Curb parking will be at right angles to the shops which face the two sides and the rear of the theater.

Across First Avenue from the theater entrance will be a block-long apartment house, one of seven identical buildings on this avenue. These will help to protect the private homes from the bustle of the shopping district.

BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION TECHNIQUES FOR DELINQUENCY PRONE YOUTH

Charles Diamont

BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION

I. Observing Behavior

A. Pinpointing

1. Directly observable
2. Beginning and end
3. Seen or heard

B. Counting

1. Event recording
2. Time sampling
3. Counting products

C. Charting

1. Graphs

D. Antecedents and consequences

II. Increasing Behavior

A. Identifying reinforcers

1. Material--tangible items such as food, jewelry, clothes, toys, and money
2. Activity--something a person likes to do
3. Social--recognition, attention, approval, praise, and feedback
4. Token--anything which can be exchanged for material, activity, or social reinforcers

B. Reinforcing behavior

1. Premack principle (ex. make playing contingent on working)
2. Accentuate the positive (praise and ignore)
3. Contiguity a necessity
4. Immediac, a necessity
5. Continuous, then intermittent

C. Ensuring reinforcer effectiveness

III. Decreasing Behavior

A. Punishment

1. Time-out from reinforcement
2. Response cost
3. Overcorrection

B. Extinction

C. Reinforcing incompatibles

IV. Creating New Behavior

A. Modeling (for new behavior)

B. Prompting (for new behavior)

1. Word prompts
2. Gesture prompts
3. "Hands on" prompts
4. Physical prompts

C. Fading

D. Shaping (for existing behavior)

1. Breaking down behavioral goals into steps
2. Determine hierarchy of difficulty
3. Have individual perform steps in order of difficulty
4. Reinforce each step
5. If step not performed well, go back to an easier step

V. Token Economies

A. For groups and individuals

B. For "carrying" over

C. Immediate

D. Visible

E. Easy to provide

F. "Back-up" reinforcers

G. Procedure

1. Pinpoint
2. Count and chart
3. State rules for earning reinforcers
4. State rules for exchange of reinforcers
5. Keep counting and charting

OUTLINE OF A MODEL PROGRAM FOR DELINQUENT AND PRE-DELINQUENT YOUTH

The First or Opening Day

Objectives

Activities (Student)

Activities/Materials (Instructor)

Special Resources, Aides, etc.

The First Week

Objectives

Activities (Student)

Activities/Materials (Instructor)

Special Resources, Aides, etc.

The First Month

Objectives (Social, Vocational, Academic)

Activities (Student)

Activities (Instructor)

Special Resources

APPENDIX C

SURVEY RECIPIENTS

Programs Listed in NAVESNP 100 Programs

1. Mr. Marion Jackson
   Boaz High School
   Boaz, Alabama 35957

2. Mr. R. Livingston
   Sitka High School
   P.O. Box 179
   Sitka, Alaska 99835

3. Mrs. Fran Wells
   Metropolitan Vocational Technical Education Center
   7701 Scott Hamilton Drive
   Little Rock, Arkansas 72209

4. Mr. Sanford Tollett
   Oak Grove High School
   100 Oakland Drive
   North Little Rock, Arkansas 72118

5. Mr. Jerry Lewis
   Highland High School
   Ault, Colorado 80610

6. Mrs. Emiko Kudo, Administrator
   Department of Education
   1270 Queen Emma Street
   Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

7. Mrs. Briley
   Columbus AVTS
   500 W. Maple
   Columbus, Kansas 66725

8. Mr. Lionel Berube
   Westbrook High School
   125 Stroudwater Strert
   Westbrook, Maine 04092

9. Mr. Irving Boynton, Coordinator
   S.W. Oakland Vocational Education Center
   1000 Beck Road
   Walled Lake, Michigan 48088

10. Mr. A.V. Renschler
    District #181 High School
    Brainerd, Minnesota 56401

11. Mr. Ed. Heiser
Alternative Jr. High School
101 Tenth Street
West Billings, Montana 59101

12. Mr. Louis Sarandoulias
Director of Special Needs
Camden County Vocational-Technical
Gloucester Township Campus
Box 266, Berlin Cross Keys Road
Sicklerville, NJ 08081

13. Mr. Joseph Scelfo
Ocean County Vocational-Technical Schools
West Water Street
Toms River, NJ 08753

14. Mr. Michael Lauten
Scotch Plains-Fanwood High School
Westfield Road
Scotch Plains, NJ 07076

15. Mr. Vincent Brennan
Syracuse Alternate High School
409 W. Genesee Street
Syracuse, NY 13202

16. Principal
ALL Vocational High School
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, NY 11210

17. Mr. Emil Lisak, Coordinator
Camp Y - NOAH & Camp Rex
70 N. Broadway
Akron, Ohio 44308

18. Mr. Carrel Bryant
Byng Public Schools
Route 3
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

19. Mr. Ronald L. Thurston, Director
Vocational Village
5040 SE Milwaukee Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97202

20. Director, Select Employment Program
Pittsburgh Public Schools
341 South Bellefield Avenue
Pittsburg, PA 15213

21. Mr. Russell McDonald
Woodruff Jr. High Schools
P.O. Box 273
Woodruff, SC 29388

22. Mr. Dale Wheat
Reagan High School
7400 Berkman Street
Austin, Texas 78752

23. Mr. George Darling
Vocational Technical Center
1301 University Avenue
Morgantown, WV 26505

24. Mr. Everett Marg, Coordinator
North and West Senior High
1100 W. Smith Avenue
Oshkosh, Wisconsin 54901

25. Alaida Irizarry DeLluch
Francisco Mendoza High School
Isabela, Puerto Rico 00662

Programs Listed in Systems-Sciences 1975

1. Mr. Joseph A. Prioli
   Director of Occupational Education
   Brockton Public School
   470 Forest Avenue
   Brockton, Mass. 02401

2. Mr. Milton Johnson
   Vocational Coordinator
   Spaulding High School
   Rochester, NH 03867

3. Mr. Gerard A. Cartier
   Federal Aid Coordinator
   Woonsocket Jr. High School
   70 North Main Street
   Woonsocket, RI 02895

4. Mr. Hans Lang
   Director, Occupational & Continuing Education
   Integrated Business Program
   Syracuse City School District
   409 W. Genessee Street
   Syracuse, NY 13202

5. Mr. Donald J. Bamford, Supervisor
   Exploratory Occupational Education
   Putnam/No. Westchester
   BOCES #1
   Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

6. Mr. Marc Bassin, Director
   Satellite Academy
   New York City Board of Education
   132 Nassau Street
   New York, NY 10038

7. Mr. Theodore M. Sheckart,
   Operation Salvage
   York County Vocational-Technical School
   2179 Queen Street
   York, PA 17402

8. Mr. Charles Matters
   Vocational Lab Assistant & Interpreter
   Reading-Muhlenbert Area Tec. School
   P.O. Box 3068
   Reading, PA 19064

9. Mrs. Helen M. Thrift
Special Program for the Disadvantaged Students
Hopewell Occupational Work Center
P.O. Box 270
Hopewell, VA 23860

10. Mrs. Joanne Norman, Coordinator
Office Services
Petersburg High School
512 W. Washington Street
Petersburg, VA 23803

11. Dr. Betsy Heinmann
V.I.P. Remedial Education
Clarksville High School
Richview Road
Clarksville, Tenn. 37040

12. Mr. William C. Wilhelm, Supervisor
Special Vocational Programs
Memphis, Tenn. 38112

13. Mr. Raymond Nunley
Vocational Learning Center
Holloway High School
Murfreesboro, Tenn. 37130

14. Mrs. Dale Bauman, Director
Occupational Training Program
District #205 Thornton Township
151st and Broadway
Harvey, Illinois 60426

15. Mr. Warren A. Collier, Instructional Coordinator
Instructional Resource Program (CWA)
Township High School District 214
799 W. Kensington Road
Mt. Prospect, Illinois 60056

16. Mr. E. Dean Browning
Admin. Assistant for Vocational Education
Alton Community Unit #11
1211 Henry Street
Alton, Illinois 62002

17. Mr. Fred S. Cook, Project Director
Senior Intensified Program
Wayne State University
College of Education
Detroit, Michigan 48202

18. Mr. Irving Boynton, Project Coordinator
Preparatory Occupational Training for
Special Needs Students
Southwest Oakland Voc. Ed. Center
1000 Beck Road
Walled Lake, Michigan 48088

19. Mr. William I. Sims, Assistant Manager
Adult & Special Voc-Ed.
Cleveland Board of Education
1380 E. 6th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

20. Mrs. Judy Brady, Director
A Concern for Special Needs Students
Mills High School
1300 Dixon Road
Little Rock, Arkansas 72206

21. Mrs. Virginia Faubel, Director
Career Advancement Program
Parkview High School
2500 Barrow Road
Little Rock, Arkansas 72204

22. Mr. David R. Enderby
Vocational Director
San Angelo I.S.D.
100 Cottonwood
San Angelo, Texas 76901

23. Mr. Thomas S. McGue
Director, Learning Skills Center
Houston I.S.D.
3200 Center Street
Houston, Texas 77007

24. J.W. Youngblood
Vocational Director
Palestine I.S.D.
Loop 256 East
Palestine, Texas 75801

25. Mr. Harold Berryhill, Director
Special Needs/Career Ed.
Newton Community High School
East 4th Street
Newton, Iowa 50208

26. Mr. Marsh Houston, Director, Home Construction
Amos Hiatt Jr. High School
East 15th Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50316

27. Mr. Ed. Schwartzkopf, Project Director
Hands-on-Training (HOT)
Lincoln Public Schools
720 South 22nd Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68510

28. Ms. Linda Sorrento, Coordinator
Supplemental Services
Adams Co., District #12
10280 No. Huron
Denver, Colorado 80221

29. Dr. Wisecup, Superintendent
School District #2
101 10th Street
West Billings, Montana 59101

30. Mr. Bernardo Sandoval
Consultant, Program for Disadvantaged
Los Angeles Unified School District
450 No. Grand Avenue H-256
Los Angeles, CA 90051

31. Dr. Robert DeBord, Director
V.E.A. Communications Skills Center
Franklin Sr. High School
Stockton City Unified
701 North Madison Street
Stockton, CA 95202

32. Mr. Gordon Kuwada, Director
Pre-Industrial Preparation Program
Waialua High School
Waialua, Hawaii 96791

33. Mr. Jerry H. Strauss, Director
Specialized Academic Vocational Education Program
Greater Anchorage Area Borough
5300 "A" Street
Anchorage, Alaska 99502

34. Mr. Ronald L. Thurston, Director
Vocational Village
Portland School Dist. #1
5040 S.E. Milwaukee Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97202

State Directors and Supervisors

1. Mr. William J. Anderson
   State Director, Vocational Education
   1535 West Jefferson Street
   Phoenix, Arizona 85007

2. Mr. David S. Bonde
   State Director of Vocational Education
   State Department of Education
   Office Building #3
   Pierre, South Dakota 57501

3. Mr. Ralph Caldwell, State Supervisor
   Division of Vocational & Technical Education
   State Department of Education
   P.O. Box 771
   Jackson, Mississippi 39205

4. Mr. Gene Callahan, State Supervisor
   State Department of Education
   Room 811
   State Office Building
   Montgomery, Alabama 36130

5. Mr. Russell S. Clark
   State Director, Vocational Education
   State Department of Education
   312 State Office Building
   Atlanta, Georgia 30334

6. Mr. Travis A. Cliett, State Supervisor
   Manpower Development & Training
   Vocational Division
   State Department of Education
   P.O. Box 771
   Jackson, Mississippi 39205

7. Mr. James Covis
   Area Vocational Director
   57 Webster Street
   Manchester, New Hampshire 03104

8. Mr. David Cronin
   Associate Commissioner for Vocational Education
   31 St. James Avenue
   Boston, Massachusetts 02116

9. Mr. Donald E. Dunkle
State Director, Vocational Education
J.G. Townsend Building
Dover, Delaware 19901

10. Ms. Joleen Durken
Secondary Vocational Coordinator
Vocational Technical Division
Minnesota Dept. of Education
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

11. Mr. Don K. Gentry
State Director, Vocational Education
401 Illinois Building
17 West Market Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

12. Ms. Betsy Heiniman, Director
Vocational Education
Montgomery County School System
Clarksville, Tennessee 37040

13. Mr. Robert Hollingshead, Supervisor
State Department of Education
206 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

14. Mr. Billy Ray Howard
State Director, Vocational Education
Capitol Plaza Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

15. Mr. Eugene Lehrmann
State Director of Vocational Education
4802 Sheboygan Avenue
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

16. Mr. Joseph W. Lewis
State Director, Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Box 771
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

17. L.L. Lewis
State Director, Vocational Education
State Department of Education
908 Rutledge Office Building
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

18. Mr. Joe D. Mills
State Director, Vocational Education
State Department of Education
306 Collins Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

19. Ms. Helen Morgan
Director, Vocational Education
Rhea County Schools
Dayton, Tennessee 37321

20. Mr. Peter Nelson, State Director
Division of Careers and Occupations
State Department of Education
Box DE
Agana, Guam 96910

21. Mr. Walter Ulrich
State Director, Vocational Education
250 East 5th Street, South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

22. Mr. Gary Whiteaker, State Supervisor
Division of Vocational Education
New State Office Building
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

SAMPLE OF CRITERIA USED IN RATING APPLICATIONS
BY SCREENING COMMITTEE OF
COUNTY VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL

1. Grade levels in the area of Basic Skills determined by Standardized Test Scores
2. Performance commensurate with Standardized Test Scores
3. Record of absenteeism and tardiness
4. Self-control and self-discipline evaluations
5. Study habits and motivational evaluations
6. Aptitude and interest in vocational areas - grades and recommendations (Shop, Home Economics, etc.) when applicable
7. School or agency recommendations, when applicable

RATING SCALE USED BY
COUNTY VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL
SCREENING COMMITTEE

Category

1. Student must possess high evaluations in ALL criteria
2. Student must possess high or average evaluations in ALL criteria
3. Student must possess average or low evaluations in ALL criteria
4. Student possesses very low evaluations in the majority of the criteria

COUNTY AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL

SAMPLE APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION

NAME _____
LAST FIRST MIDDLE

ADDRESS _____
STREET TOWN ZIP CODE

HOME PHONE _____ SEX _____

BIRTH DATE _____ BIRTH PLACE _____

NAME OF PARENT/GUARDIAN _____

HOME SCHOOL _____ PRESENT GRADE _____

- -

COURSE REQUEST: 1st choice _____

2nd choice _____

TIME PREFERENCE (circle) A.M. P.M.

Have you ever made application to the Vocational School before? (circle) YES NO

If yes, please specify when: _____

PARENTAL APPROVAL

_____ has my approval to enroll as a
Student's Name
student in the County Area Vocational-Technical School.

_____
Signature of parent/guardian

_____ _____
Name of Local Board of Ed. Signature of Local Administrator

*NOTE: This application must be signed by the local administrator in your district to signify your district's knowledge of this application.

APPLICATION WILL NOT BE PROCESSED UNTIL ALL SUPPORTING DATA IS RECEIVED:
( ) Local Administrator's Form
( ) Transcript
( ) Standardized test results (aptitude, interest)
( ) Health Record

DEADLINE FOR 1977-1978 SCHOOL YEAR: APRIL 1, 1977

COUNTY AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL

TO BE FILLED OUT BY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Student's Name_____ Grade_____

1. Attendance: Number of days late and absent this year.

   Lateness_____ Absence_____

2. Has the applicant been suspended this year: _____

3. Do you know of any health factors (physical or emotional) in this applicant's history that would constitute a safety hazard to himself/herself or others in our shop areas?

   _____

   _____

   _____

4. Has the applicant been classified according to Title 18A Chapter 46? _____

5. If yes, please attach copy of Child Study Team Report and recommendations.

6. Classification is: _____

7. Last date of Child Study Evaluation: _____

8. Other Pertinent Comments: _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

_____ _____

Date Principal's Signature

_____ _____

School District

SAMPLE APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION
COUNTY VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOLS

(Please PRINT all information asked for below)

DATE: _____

I, _____ hereby make application for admission to the County Vocational and Technical High School for the school year 19___ to 19___.

INDICATE SHOP CHOICE
(1st, 2nd, 3rd)

_____Air Cond. & Refrig.
_____Architectural Drafting
_____Auto Body Repair
_____Auto Mechanics
_____Baking
_____Beauty Culture
_____Carpentry
_____Clerical Occupations
_____Commercial Art
_____Commercial Foods
_____Diesel Mechanics*
_____Electrical Trades
_____Electronics
_____Fashion Design
_____Graphic Arts
_____Health Occupations*
_____Machine Shop
_____Medical Secretary*
_____Ornamental Horticulture
_____Painting and Decorating
_____Plumbing
_____Practical Nursing
_____Sheet Metal
_____Technical Drafting & Design
_____Upholstery
_____Welding

*Program begins in 11th grade

Grade to Enter 9 10 11 12 Adult

Sex: M F Age_____

Present School_____ Present Counselor_____

Have you ever applied to the vocational schools before? _____

When? _____

Additional information will be obtained by us from the school you now attend.

Your parent's or guardian's signature below gives permission for the school you are now attending to release this information and also signifies his/her consent to your application.

_____
Signature of Parent or Guardian

_____
Street Address City

_____
Phone No.

SCHOOL RECORD OF _____
Last First Middle

BIRTH DATE _____

This part of the application should be filled out by an authorized school official.

How many days has the applicant been absent during this school year? _____ days out of a possible _____ days.

How many times has the applicant been tardy during this period? _____

IQ_____ Name of test_____ Date Given_____

Reading Test Score_____ Test_____ Date Given_____

Mathematics Test Score____ Test_____ Date Given_____

Additional Test Information:

Other pertinent information:

Attitude towards school:

Attitude towards peers:

Referral agencies (If none, please state "none"):

Health limitations (If none, please state "none"):

Other counselor comments:

_____ _____ _____
School Official's Signature Title Date

SAMPLE ADMISSION INFORMATION
Pupil Entering from Junior or Senior High School
to
COUNTY VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL

A pupil cannot be admitted to the County Vocational and Technical High School without parental approval. Your cooperation in filling out and returning this form by mail will be appreciated. If your school has a similar form it is acceptable. A transcript must evantually be obtained for students who have ninth grade credit who are accepted. Please complete Section IV in all cases. You will be notified promptly of the disposition made of this request for admission.

Section I -- General Information

Date _____

School _____

Applicant's Name _____
Last First Middle

Address _____

Date of Birth _____ Present Grade _____

Is it likely that this pupil will complete this grade this year?
_____

Section II -- Achievement (Please Check)

Subjects	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Failing
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Section III -- Test Results

Type	Score	Name of Test	Date Tested
Reading Level	_____	_____	_____
Arithmetic Level	_____	_____	_____

Multifactor Aptitude Test: Name _____

Scores _____

_____ Date _____

Others _____

_____ Date _____

Section IV -- Other Guidance Information

Vocational Interest or Goal _____

Attitude Toward School _____

Attendance Record _____

Known Physical Defects _____

Principal's Recommendation Concerning Admission _____

_____

_____

_____
Signature of Principal

- -

Do Not Write In This Space

Date of Receipt of Completed Form X _____

Date Form Y-A Sent to Local School _____

Date Form Y-R Sent to Local School _____